

JPRS-TAC-85-023

9 August 1985

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

9 August 1985

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

GENERAL

USSR: Gorbachev-Reagan Summit Atmosphere Assessed (Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 18 Jul 85).....	1
IZVESTIYA Contrasts U.S., Soviet Nonproliferation Policies (Moscow IZVESTIYA, 14 Jul 85).....	4
PRAVDA Reports American Letters to Gorbachev on Arms Control (Moscow PRAVDA, 13 Jul 85).....	8
Soviet, U.S. Scientists Confer on 'Nuclear Winter' Threat (Moscow IZVESTIYA, 2 Jul 85).....	12
TASS Reports U.S. Scientists Issue Nuclear Appeal (Moscow TASS, 16 Jul 85).....	14
PRAVDA Weekly Review: Geneva Talks, CDE, SDI, ABM (Moscow PRAVDA, 14 Jul 85).....	15
Soviet, U.S. Scientists Discuss Arms Issues, Bilateral Ties (Moscow Television Service, 16 Jul 85).....	18
Italian Foreign Minister Discusses Gorbachev's Moves, Arms Talks (Giulio Andreotti Interview; Rome LA REPUBBLICA, 5 Jul 85).....	22

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

Dutch Commentator Sees Need for U.S. Concessions in Geneva (An Salomonson; Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD, 1 Jul 85).....	24
CSSR Foreign Minister on UN, Arms Negotiations (Bohuslav Chnoupek; Prague RUDE PRAVO, 28 Jun 85).....	27
Prague Views 'Trick' of Bush's European Tour (Frantisek Vonderka; Prague Domestic Service, 7 Jul 85)....	29

CSSR Commentary on 2nd Round Highlights Space Issue (Bratislava Domestic Service, 15 Jul 85).....	31
SPACE ARMS	
USSR's Zhukov, Velikhov Assail SDI at WPC March Meeting (Moscow XX CENTURY AND PEACE, No 5, May 85).....	33
Editorial Introduction	33
Zhukov, Velikhov, Molina Speeches	34
Delegates From 15 Countries Discuss Arms Control (Paris AFP, 7 Jul 85).....	37
FRG Chancellery's Schaeuble on SDI Participation (Bonn DIE WELT, 12 Jul 85).....	38
FRG Trade Union Statement Advises Against SDI (Bonn DIE WELT, 11 Jul 85).....	40
FRG Research Ministry Does Not Have Funds for SDI, Eureka (Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU, 10 Jul 85).....	41
Dregger Sees German Participation in SDI as Inevitable (Karl Feldmeyer; Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE, 12 Jun 85).....	42
Dutch Paper Hopes for European Rejection of SDI (Editorial; Amsterdam DE VOLKSKRANT, 21 Jun 85).....	45
Canada Studies Participation in SDI (Toronto THE SATURDAY STAR, 1 Jun 85; Ottawa THE CITIZEN, 13, 18 Jun 85).....	47
Nielsen on Private Firms	47
Clark Assurance on Committee	48
Second Parliamentary Committee	48
Australia's Hayden Says Concept Under Consideration (Melbourne Overseas Service, 15 Jul 85).....	49
INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES	
PRAVDA Hits U.S., NATO Pressure on Netherlands (Moscow PRAVDA, 22 Jul 85).....	51
USSR: U.S. Missile, Bomber Deployments in East Asia (Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 20 Jul 85).....	52

USSR Military Journal on French, UK Nuclear Forces' NATO Role (V. Roshchupkin; Moscow KOMMUNIST VOORUZHENNYKH SIL, No 5, Mar 85).....	53
USSR: FRG Missile Development Shows Nuclear Ambitions (Moscow TASS, 24 Jul 85).....	62
FRG Challenges to Legality of Pershing-2 Deployments Noted (Moscow IZVESTIYA, 27 Jun 85).....	63
Definitive Dutch Decision on INF Viewed Unlikely (P. F. Maas; Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD, 13 Jun 85).....	66

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE

Grinevskiy Press Conference on CSCE Anniversary (Moscow TASS, 24 Jul 85).....	70
Soviet Ambassador Grinevskiy Examines Latest Session (Moscow PRAVDA, 23 Jul 85).....	71
Pivot of Debate	71
On Confidence	72
Deeds Are Needed	73

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

USSR: Reports on Proceedings of Summer 1985 Session (Various sources, various dates).....	75
Major Issues Surveyed	75
Soviet, Bloc Envoys Hit SDI	77
IZVESTIYA Report	78
Moscow Commentary on SDI	79
Israelyan Hits U.S. Congress on CBW	79
Soviet Envoy Addresses Special Committee on Space Arms (Vsevolod Shishkovskiy; Moscow Television Service, 25 Jun 85).....	80

MUTUAL AND BALANCED FORCE REDUCTIONS

USSR Blames NATO for Lack of Progress in 36th Round (Moscow TASS, 11 Jul 85; Moscow Television Service, 15 Jul 85).....	81
Soviet Chief Delegate Comments	81
West 'Marking Time'	82

CSSR Delegation Head on West's Lack of 'Political Resolve' (Ludek Handl; Prague Domestic Service, 12 Jul 85).....	84
CSSR: West Failed To Use 'Great Opportunity' in 36th Round (Bratislava ROLNICKE NOVINY, 11 Jul 85).....	86
Briefs	
Czechoslovak Delegate on Talks	88
CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS	
PRAVDA Sees U.S. Blocking Agreement at Geneva on Ban (B. Azanov; Moscow PRAVDA, 20 Jul 85).....	89
Why the Talks Are at a Standstill	89
Washington's New Tricks	90
The Peoples' Mounting Alarm	91
NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS	
TASS Hits Shultz' 'Threats' to New Zealand (Moscow TASS, 18 Jul 85).....	93
PRAVDA Views Canceling of ANZUS Meeting, Canberra Talks (Moscow PRAVDA, 18 Jul 85).....	95
Australian Prime Minister on U.S. Reaction to NZ Proposal (Hong Kong AFP, 18 Jul 85).....	96
Seychelles Minister Calls for Indian Ocean NFZ (Victoria NATION, 20 Jun 85).....	97
NUCLEAR TESTING	
Gorbachev Announces Nuclear Explosion Moratorium (M. S. Gorbachev; Moscow PRAVDA, 30 Jul 85).....	99
USSR on Responses to Gorbachev Moratorium Announcement (Moscow TASS International Service, 29, 30 Jul 85; Moscow TASS, 30 Jul 85).....	100
TASS Hits U.S. Response	100
Japanese Public Welcomes Moratorium	101
Center for Defense Information	102
TASS on U.S. Invitation To Observe Nuclear Test (Moscow TASS, 29 Jul 85).....	103
Briefs	
Swedes Report Soviet Blast	104

GENERAL

USSR: GORBACHEV-REAGAN SUMMIT ATMOSPHERE ASSESSED

PM180824 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 18 Jul 85 First Edition p 1

[Gennadiy Shishkin "International Review": "For Dialogue in the Name of Peace"]

[Text] It is 2 weeks since publication of the announcement of the upcoming Soviet-American summit meeting, but the world public is continuing to discuss with unflagging attention the possible prospects that open up in this connection. And this is quite natural. Under the conditions of the disturbing and dangerous international situation, the dilemma with which mankind is faced is increasingly keenly felt throughout the world: either the further fueling of tension and confrontation, or a constructive quest for mutually acceptable accords that would stop the preparation of nuclear conflict.

It is clear that all states -- both large and small -- must take part in the quest for realistic solutions of the acute problems of our time. But it is also clear that a special role in this also belongs above all to the USSR and the United States, in relations between which, despite certain shifts recently, there is something like an ice age. Yet fantastic forces of destruction capable of annihilating all life on earth many times over are concentrated in the two countries' arsenals. A colossal quantity of nuclear warheads has been stockpiled in the world. On average each warhead possesses much greater destructive power than the bomb that destroyed Hiroshima. Each of the 36 American strategic submarines packs more firepower than man has used against man in his entire history. Thousands of nuclear warheads are ready for immediate use against targets nearby or at the other side of the world, although just a few hundred warheads are enough to totally destroy the biggest country.

In welcoming the accord on a meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan 19-20 November in Geneva, the most diverse statesmen and representatives of the public and the press are expressing the hope that it is a manifestation of statecraft [gosudarstvennaya mudrost] and will lead to the return of Soviet-American relations to a normal course to the benefit of strengthened world peace and security. THE NEW YORK TIMES believes that "this meeting in a certain sense will inevitably be a milestone after 6 years of deteriorating relations." "The very fact of the meeting," the newspaper stresses, "marks an attempt to evaluate afresh the nature and importance of Soviet-American relations."

UN Secretary General Perez de Cuellar declared that the role of the Soviet-American summit meeting is to "help improve the international climate." The meeting, he added, "must create a favorable atmosphere for solving the many problems that are encountered daily."

Similar thoughts have been expressed by many West European statesmen too. Thus, Danish Foreign Minister Ellemann Jensen declared: "The Danish Government greeted with great satisfaction the accord between the United States and the USSR on holding a meeting in Geneva. This decision is an expression of an absolutely essential intensification of East-West dialogue. There are so many unsolved problems in East-West relations that it is necessary for the upcoming meeting to make a real contribution to solving them."

The unanimous approval with which the accord on holding the summit meeting was greeted everywhere reflects the acute need, a need that objectively exists, to cooperate in organizing dialogue in order to seek realistic solutions relaxing tension in the world and helping to bar the way of the arms race. People throughout the world are hopefully expecting that an honest and fruitful quest for joint ways to improve relations between the USSR and the United States and to make them more stable and constructive will take place in Geneva. They expect the top-level meeting to give substantial impetus to precisely that kind of development in Soviet-American relations.

In this connection many statesmen, politicians, and public figures are expressing satisfaction at the fact that the Soviet leadership has repeatedly emphasized its sincere desire to return Soviet-American relations to a normal course. The words spoken by M. S. Gorbachev in his conversation with the speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives made a great impression on American public opinion: "We do not believe that the present tension in these relations is based on any fatal clash between the two countries' national interests. On the contrary, our peoples can gain a great deal from the development of broad and fruitful cooperation."

The peoples of the world are drawing the only possible conclusion from all this: The USSR resolutely advocates honest dialogue and invariably displays its goodwill.

What about the other side? What does it intend to bring to Geneva?

Statements of "desire for mutual understanding" have also now begun to appear in Washington. It could not be otherwise. The desire of the broad American and world public for a lessening of international tension is too great. But the "peacemaking" remarks of representatives of the Reagan administration are clearly made in an undertone and are accompanied by provisos that nullify them. Thus U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz stated at a press conference in Washington that "the President regards the upcoming summit meeting as a means of lessening the disagreements between the two countries and of deepening dialogue." However, he immediately added that President Reagan intends to raise the question of violations by the USSR of the "SALT II" Treaty. This is said by the representative of an administration that torpedoed that treaty, thwarted its ratification, and is now working to effectively eliminate it!

It is certainly no accident that an informed observer of political feelings in the Washington corridors of power like THE WASHINGTON POST political writer Geyelin described the top-level meeting as a "leap into the unknown."

Unfortunately, it has to be stated that a great deal that is happening in the American capital confirms the correctness of that assessment. The impression emerges that Washington has learned nothing. Take for instance the official statement by U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for European and Canadian Affairs Burt setting out the administration's version of why the top-level meeting became possible. "Over the course of Reagan's period in office," he asserted, "the USSR has begun to respect him. They have come to see him as a strong guy who is prepared to increase defense spending.

Thus we have laid the foundation for a successful top-level meeting. This is why the President earlier refused a meeting. He realized that without a strong military base he would be unable to achieve success during a meeting."

As we can see, Washington is still entertaining the hope that it will succeed in pursuing the long since bankrupt "position of strength" policy vis-a-vis the USSR. The absolute invalidity of such calculations and hopes is so self-evident that even THE WASHINGTON POST found it necessary to publicly condemn this approach. The newspaper emphasizes: "The President, by contrast, has never even been able to cope with the disagreements existing within his administration between the ideologists, the pragmatists, and the politicians."

The American public resolutely demands from the administration a serious, businesslike, and constructive approach to the upcoming summit. "This is just the occasion," THE NEW YORK TIMES, for example, states, "when Reagan's ability to impress and America's obsession with radio and television could prove to be a millstone rather than an advantage."

There is now a need for something bigger and longer-lasting so that not only these two giant countries but the entire world can concern themselves with present-day problems while feeling secure to some extent. Smiles alone are manifestly not enough."

The USSR is going to the summit meeting in Geneva with a firm intention to do everything incumbent upon it to ensure its success in the interests of peace and the security of not only the Soviet and American peoples but the peoples of the entire world. But this in no way means that it is prepared to forgo the interests of its people and the peoples of the fraternal socialist countries. M.S. Gorbachev made a statement of principle on this at the CPSU Central Committee March Plenum: "We will firmly follow the Leninist course of peace and peaceful coexistence. The USSR will always respond to goodwill with goodwill and to trust with trust. But everyone should know that we will never forgo the interests of our motherland and its allies."

CSO: 5200/1322

GENERAL

IZVESTIYA CONTRASTS U.S., SOVIET NONPROLIFERATION POLICIES

PM180916 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Jul 85 Morning Edition p 5

[Valentin Falin "Political Observer's Opinion": "Nonproliferation Washington-Style"]

[Text] Among the few gratifying phenomena in the "international community's activity within the UN framework," U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz highlights the efforts made in the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. Today, he noted at a meeting held to mark the 40th anniversary of the United Nations, the same five countries "openly" possess nuclear weapons, not 20 or 25 countries as predicted a few decades ago. And "this happened not by chance but as the result of colossal efforts." According to the U.S. diplomatic leader, nonproliferation is "the sphere where persistent and coordinated efforts (under UN auspices) have paid off to date and we (the United States) will continue working on this problem."

Unlike many of his administration colleagues, G. Shultz prudently refrained from trying to present the United States as an unfailingly ardent champion of the idea of nonproliferation or banning of nuclear weapons. You cannot claim what is not true. If you ignore the plans to continue the U.S. nuclear monopoly at any price, including by means of preventive nuclear strikes against a "potential enemy's" scientific and industrial centers, Washington did not examine the other forms of nonproliferation seriously before 1965. At that time, it was thinking of the complete opposite or, to be precise, the unlimited use of nuclear weapons as of "any other weapon." And it all seemed as simple as two plus two until the nuclear monopoly disappeared. The chance was lost, America's present-day rulers recall when looking back to that time, we were too soft. Well, the time had come to stop, to take the military sting out of atomic energy, and to put it to work for people's good.

But that did not happen. When the Soviet Union has created its own atomic bomb, Washington reasoned, we, the United States, will threaten it again with a hydrogen bomb, deploy nuclear weapons in all the key areas of the world, and involve other countries either directly or indirectly in the preparations for nuclear wars.

I understand direct involvement to mean the deployment of U.S. nuclear charges on the territories and in the waters of nonnuclear states. I take direct proliferation to mean the transfer of U.S. nuclear weapons to nonnuclear states for their own practical use or for use by Americans on the orders of those states.

Faced with the spread of the nuclear danger around the world, the Warsaw Pact countries put forward an initiative; to ban nuclear weapons tests, create nuclear-free zones and oblige states possessing nuclear weapons not to deploy them outside their borders or

place such weapons at the disposal of any other states or at the command of military blocs. The West responded to that in 1957 with the decision to set up stockpiles of nuclear charges in Europe designed for the joint use of NATO members. That was also the response to the Soviet proposal submitted at the United Nations to begin formulating international agreements on the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons.

The following year Ireland proposed a UN General Assembly draft resolution in support of nonproliferation. The United States did not support that either, claiming that observance of the commitments made was "unverifiable." Washington maneuvered. It forced through projects for the creation of "multilateral NATO nuclear forces," "combined or "Atlantic forces," or, at the very least, a U.S.-West German alliance within the Atlantic company. America's energy as a state was focused in that area until late 1964, when it became clear that the attempts to spread nuclear weapons through channels which seemed tempting or suitable to the Americans had failed.

Now we can understand a little better why G. Shultz prefers to count the "coordinated efforts" under UN auspices from the signing of the nuclear weapons nonproliferation treaty of 1 June 1968. Good. We are not going to remind you every step of the way who presented mankind with this most difficult problem. We are going to follow the secretary of state and try to work out the extent to which the opportunities presented when the treaty came into force were realized. Given honest and consistent implementation, such a treaty could be a step, and a major step at that, toward banning and destroying nuclear weapons and not simply a means of limiting the number of nuclear powers.

By investing the accord with that meaning above all, the Soviet Union strove persistently for settlements which would lead to a narrowing of the geographical proliferation of nuclear weapons and the creation of nuclear-free zones and would reduce the likelihood of them being used both in conflicts between nuclear powers themselves and during a period of deterioration in their relations with nonnuclear states. The USSR accomplished a historic act. It adopted a unilateral commitment not to be first to use nuclear weapons, thereby providing the political and legal basis for neutralizing the nuclear danger.

There were quite a few proposals, although all or virtually all of our initiatives invariably ran into an impenetrable wall of insincerity, prejudice, and hostility. And all because the Americans wanted to adapt even nonproliferation to suit their doctrines of combatting socialism and the national liberation movements. The main thing for them is to ensure that nuclear technology does not find itself in what Washington regards as "unreliable" hands. But the Americans are capable of overlooking leaks of enriched or fissionable raw materials, equipment, and even nuclear installation spares from their own country to, for example, Israel, South Africa, or Pakistan.

I recall that one of the R. Reagan administration's main arguments for militarizing space and deploying global antimissile defenses is to seek possibilities for disarming nuclear weapons by safe means and thereby halt the nuclear arms race so as to effectively eliminate nuclear war from society's life at some point in the distant future. Let us pretend that we believe the originators of those assurances. But not to the extent that we forget about the existence of certain commitments which the sides have made.

The limitation of offensive strategic armaments and the limitation of ABM systems in the seventies were the fruits of the same policy and both processes were based on the same premises. Undermining one part of the equation will inevitably spoil the other.

We are entitled to take our analysis further. Would detente and the package of arms control agreements accompanying it have been possible without accords banning nuclear weapon tests in the three environments and accords on nonproliferation? It is highly doubtful. Increasing the number of nuclear states would have made the arms race even more deadly in character. Conversely, it is hardly conceivable that the nonproliferation system as a whole would have stood the test had the USSR and the United States not followed up the conclusion of the 1968 treaty by beginning the strategic arms limitation process, which, after equalizing the security conditions of its participants, was to lead to a real and perceptible lowering of the level and intensity of military confrontation.

Let us take the 1972 ABM treaty. It prohibits the USSR and the United States from creating, testing, or deploying ABM systems or components based at sea, in the air, in space, or in mobile land-based form, from enabling missiles, launch installations, and radar stations to resolve tasks involved in combatting strategic elements in their flight trajectory, and from testing them for ABM purposes. Both powers pledged themselves, furthermore, not to transfer ABM systems or their components limited by the treaty to other states and not to deploy them outside their own national territory.

Let us compare these precise treaty provisions with the promises to create hardware which automatically makes nuclear and all other kinds of weapons obsolete and useless. The question is not whether this is feasible. Most authoritative specialists and scientists consider that it is not. Nevertheless, a course is being adopted toward a completely new structure of military confrontation or, more precisely perhaps, toward a continuous confrontation of strength which will make the cold war look like a picnic.

The U.S. Administration stubbornly propounds the idea that strength is always more reliable than right and that no treaty will ever replace a good weapons system. It wants to use the ABM limitation treaty to produce another treaty authorizing unlimited ABM defense. And to resolve everything by means of "universal defenses." With a wave of the magic wand offensive weapons will lose their meaning and nuclear charges will become unfit for use. There you have it, the long-awaited manna from space, praise be to those who peddle it.

The idea of "disarming nuclear weapons by means of nonnuclear weapons" and resolving once and for all the nonproliferation problem without treaties has an enticing propaganda ring to it. The alluring simplicity of it tempts you to overlook the "details." You can disregard the fact that offensive weapons lose their edge with regard to states possessing sophisticated ABM defenses which will be available, if they are ever created, only to the chosen few because of their inordinate cost and extreme technical complexity. Those not chosen, that is, the majority, will become even more vulnerable.

Attention is also being diverted from the fact that the United States is not assembling its space army to combat nuclear weapons at all. Its schemes are aimed primarily at combatting the Soviet nuclear potential while keeping its own in reserve. How is it proposing to stake its claim to military superiority and hegemonism this time?

Via the total "modernization" of the offensive arsenal and the development of technologies which, as Pentagon documents stress, should make Soviet defenses "obsolete." ABM defense is one such technology. The United States cannot cope with this extremely risky and exhausting venture alone. To combat the Soviet Union in the spirit of Reagan's "crusade," it is necessary to recruit all "soldiers of freedom," using the bait of direct involvement in the "star wars battalions."

Washington's present vain attempts to fit Western Europe and Japan into its "strategic initiative" are like the aforementioned "multilateral nuclear forces." But these are some kind of "multilateral antinuclear forces." However, changing the disguise does not replace or alter the essence, the illusory hope of regaining, albeit temporarily, if not the nuclear monopoly than at least an overwhelming superiority from which political and economic dividends could be drawn. In brief, nuclear disarmament and nonproliferation in the old style are like inferior versions of the notorious Baruch and Dulles plans.

The relentless logic of struggle dictates an adequate response to a challenge, to "war under conditions of peace" according to the latest American terminology. That response will not be arranged to fit the U.S. concepts. It will be measured against the defense needs of the USSR and its allies and friends. And there is no need to play games here. Planning strikes involving nonnuclear facilities against nuclear installations is the same as preparing nuclear aggression. Nonnuclear states which join in this venture will be capable, at least in theory, of unleashing nuclear war. Their nonnuclear status will turn into fiction. The nuclear weapon nonproliferation system will also become a fiction.

G. Shultz is an experienced politician and is perfectly well aware of the disastrous consequences for the cause of arms control, including the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons on earth, if the arms race spreads to space. However, the official position is clearly more binding than the responsibility for the future of civilization that goes with the post. Be that as it may, the secretary of state is diligently covering up his tracks with assurances that he knows the secret of the immaculate conception of what is probably the most evil offspring of militarism to whom Washington has given outer space as a toy, much to the peoples' sorrow.

CSO: 5200/1322

GENERAL

PRAVDA REPORTS AMERICAN LETTERS TO GORBACHEV ON ARMS CONTROL

PM170756 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Jul 85 First Edition p 4

[N. Kurdyumov article: "Finding the Way to Peace and Harmony"]

[Text] "I am one of those U.S. citizens working for the sake of world peace. I am particularly gratified at your desire to work for the good of the cause of peace and improved relations with the United States through nuclear arms limitation. I wholeheartedly support this position. Many of us insist on our leaders striving for the same goal too."

The above letter from American Jill D. Bastian of Michigan is one of many letters arriving in Moscow addressed to M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, from people of goodwill and ordinary U.S. citizens. There are long and short, handwritten and typed letters.

"Many Americans see your accession to your present post as a ray of hope in Soviet-U.S. relations," Karl Bodek of Missoula, Montana writes for his part.

"While it seems that our President and many of our national leaders are unable or unwilling to approach the Soviet Union other than with suspicion and a sense of hostility, I must tell you that many Americans do not share that attitude. I am one of them and I believe that we live on the same planet and must find ways of living together in peace and harmony."

These and many other messages are convincing testimony and confirmation of the high prestige of the foreign policy of the Land of the Soviets and the profound respect felt everywhere by honest and unprejudiced people for the activity of the CPSU and the Soviet government, which strive tirelessly and consistently to ensure that the easing of international tension and businesslike cooperation among the peoples become the natural and constant state of international life. Millions of people in the world, and that includes the United States, see the Soviet Union and the guarantor of peace and pin their innermost hopes for a peaceful future on it because they know that the core of the Soviet Union's foreign policy is the struggle to maintain peace, end the monstrous arms race, and prevent a world nuclear conflagration. The Soviet Union is convinced that there are no international questions that cannot be settled around the negotiating table. "It must be the supreme duty of a government and responsible statesmen," M.S. Gorbachev noted, "to seek any opportunity to remove the threat of nuclear war."

The letters from the United States confirm that this is consonant with Americans' sentiments and aspirations. Thus, Pastor E. Paul Weaver of Everett, Pennsylvania writes:

"Millions of Americans appeal to you to lead mankind down the road of peace. I have lived long enough to know that it is hard for one people to establish peace. All countries must be sincere in seeking peace and justice for all. Many of us in the United States are trying to help everyone to understand that our country must serve people and not hold sway over other countries. We do not need 'star wars,' we do not need more bombs, missiles, and chemical and bacteriological weapons. We need leaders who will use their influence to create peace, justice, and good for all."

Those thoughts and hopes are shared by people of various ages and various social positions. All of them, wherever they live, be it in large cities or the American "backwoods," are united by a single common anxiety for the fate of the world and the children's future and by a single desire -- to curb the highly dangerous arms race. It is no accident that virtually all the letters from the United States are imbued with the same idea: to prevent what may be irreparable and eradicate the dangerous tension in Soviet-U.S. relations.

Clayton Brown Jr., a citizen of Griffin, Georgia, writes: "Very cool relations have existed between the United States and the USSR for too long. It is high time for our countries to jointly stop the crazy arms race, which exhausts our resources and sows alarm in the hearts of people worldwide. After all, each of our countries is capable of wiping the other off the face of the earth and destroying the whole planet."

"Goddammit," the writer of the letter writes, "we should learn to live in peace, reduce the enormous arsenals of destruction, and use the money to build housing for our peoples and carry out new agricultural programs. What new breakthroughs could be achieved in the field of medicine! The list of good deeds we could do to improve people's lives is endless."

In his letter, Californian Ed Manuel shares his views on the need to resume the climate of trust. "As an American tourist who has visited the Soviet Union," he notes, "I have wonderful memories of my trip. It confirmed that the Soviet people, like most Americans, sincerely want peace. I particularly remember an exhibit devoted to the docking of the Soyuz and Apollo Soviet and U.S. spaceships which I saw at the exhibition of national economic achievements. I was moved by this symbol of cooperation between our two countries. And it is even more meaningful now that Soviet-U.S. relations are at such a low ebb."

"Distrust," the letter writer notes, "has always been the stumbling block in the way of fruitful talks on arms control. But without effective talks on disarmament, the danger of a nuclear catastrophe will grow more and more."

People in the Soviet Union share the opinion of the letter-writers regarding the importance of creating an atmosphere of mutual trust. As M.S. Gorbachev noted in a talk with the speaker of the House of Representatives, we do not believe that any inevitable clash of the two countries' national interests lies at the basis of the current tension in these relations. An improvement in USSR-U.S. relations is not only extremely necessary but possible. To do this, political will is required from the two countries' leaders. The Soviet side has that will.

The new Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva on nuclear and space arms, begun on the USSR's initiative, and the Soviet proposal that the USSR and the United States should introduce a moratorium on the creation -- including scientific research -- testing, and deployment of space strike arms, and should freeze their strategic offensive arms, and that the deployment of U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe, and, correspondingly, the

buildup of Soviet retaliatory measures be simultaneously stopped for the duration of the Geneva talks elicited a positive response from Americans. To set an example the USSR, as is well known, unilaterally introduced a moratorium until November on the deployment of its medium-range missiles and the implementation of other retaliatory measures in Europe.

"On behalf of the millions of American citizens concerned at the continuing escalation of the arms race, we applaud the start of the Geneva talks," writes Jane Greenbau, executive director of the "Campaign for a nuclear weapons freeze" movement. She notes that the Soviet proposal on the introduction of a bilateral moratorium on nuclear and space arms opens up "extensive opportunities" for stopping and reversing the arms race. "We call on our government to respond positively to this proposal," she says in the letter.

In their letters, Dale E. Kayl of Birmingham, Alabama, Jay Beyr, a peace movement activist from North Dakota, and others call on the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee to do everything possible to achieve tangible progress at the Geneva talks. This attention to the talks is natural. After all, their outcome will determine the further development of events in the world. This is the choice: either an arms race in all directions and the growth of the threat of war, or the strengthening of universal security and more lasting peace for all.

Guided by a sense of high responsibility for the fate of world peace, in its approach to the talks the Soviet Union proceeds on the basis that real and major reductions in the nuclear arms accumulated on earth and the prevention of the arms race in space can be achieved on an honest and just basis. It is quite obvious that without an agreement on the nonmilitarization of space and without the United States abandoning its adventurist "star wars" plans, no reductions in nuclear forces will be possible. However, the U.S. side stubbornly refuses to hold concrete talks on the nonmilitarization of space. It also shuns any discussion of the Soviet Union's newly confirmed proposal on immediately introducing a moratorium on nuclear and space arms, which would halt the arms race on earth right now and would prevent it from spreading to space.

The same U.S. Administration line can be seen in Washington's reluctance to agree to end nuclear weapons tests. Meanwhile the writers of many letters from the United States believe that the total ending of all nuclear detonations might be an important step on the road toward ending the arms race and preventing a nuclear war. This decision, Mr and Mrs Lee Lyons of Santa Barbara, California note in particular, "would probably lead to a reduction of the nuclear threat since it is unlikely that either of the sides would deploy untested weapons."

"I would like to hope," the same letter goes on to say, "that you will soon meet with President Reagan and reach mutual agreement on putting a stop to nuclear tests as the first step toward peace."

Many letters from American citizens contain calls for talks on concluding a relevant treaty and support for the proposal to announce a moratorium on all nuclear tests on 6 August 1985 -- the 40th anniversary of the dropping of the atom bomb on Hiroshima. This was mentioned by Natalie Berrill of Montgomery, Massachusetts; Joanne Kincade of Cripple Creek, Colorado; Jane Mayer of New York; John P. Cotton of Boca Raton, Florida; Joelle M. Harp of Knoxville, Tennessee; I. James Young of Arlington Heights, Illinois; and others.

Donald Detweiler of Arlington, Maryland [as published] writes: "Please look at the proposal to end all nuclear tests starting 6 August 1985. I am making a similar appeal to our President R. Reagan."

This decision, Professor Gabor T. (German) of Pennsylvania University notes for his part, "would considerably reduce the risk of nuclear war" and would make it possible to worthily and positively "mark the horror of the dropping of the atom bomb 4 decades ago."

The Soviet Union, as is well known, gave a clear and unambiguous reply to the appeal from the leaders of the Washington Defense Information Center that a moratorium be declared on all nuclear tests effective 6 August this year. The Soviet side stated the possibility of the practical implementation of this proposal, given a positive attitude to it on the part of the other nuclear powers. The USSR also expressed readiness to immediately resume talks on concluding a treaty on the complete and universal prohibition of nuclear tests, which were broken off through the fault of the United States.

What is Washington's position? As Rear Admiral (Retired) G. La Rocque, director of the Defense Information Center, stated, the Reagan administration's response to the proposed moratorium "was couched negatively." Recently, H. Bethe, the eminent American scientist and Nobel Prize winner, warned that one of the reasons for the White House's refusal to hold talks aimed at drawing up a treaty on the universal prohibition of nuclear weapons tests is, in particular, the U.S. Administration's intention to deploy in space within the "star wars" framework laser weapons operating on the energy of a nuclear explosion.

The letters from overseas addressed to Comrade M.S. Gorbachev are, as a rule, moving human documents. They confirm that the foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state and their struggle to maintain and strengthen peace, to ensure arms reductions, and to improve the international situation and international cooperation on the basis of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems correspond to the hopes, interests, and aspirations of all people of goodwill and all peoples and meet with great support worldwide.

CSO: 5200/1322

GENERAL

SOVIET, U.S. SCIENTISTS CONFER ON 'NUCLEAR WINTER' THREAT

PM041533 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Jul 85 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent V. Kuznetsov dispatch under the rubric "IZVESTIYA Interview": "Security Through Cooperation"]

[Text] Geneva--The seminar "Nuclear War, Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Their Consequences," organized by the international Balle Rive Group, has concluded its work.

More than 500 politicians, military, scientists, and representatives of public organizations and antiwar movements spent 3 days discussing problems associated with the prevention of the nuclear arms race, the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, and the danger of a nuclear missile clash in regional conflicts.

Participating in the sessions were Ye. P. Velikhov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Academician G. A. Arbatov; AN. A. Gromyko, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences; and A. A. Kokoshin, deputy chairman of the Committee of Soviet Scientists in Defense of Peace and Against the Nuclear Threat.

The forum participants told us:

Ye. P. Velikhov:

"At the seminar the majority agreed with the opinion that it is impossible to win a nuclear war and that no one will be spared its deadly breath in either the Northern or the Southern Hemisphere. The results of research conducted by scientists of various countries were examined in detail in Geneva. The data from this research give grounds for a dismal conclusion--in the climatic, genetic, medical, and sanitary spheres a universal nuclear conflict would be the last in our planet's history. President Reagan's 'Strategic Defense Initiative' is a hypocritical 'alternative' to nuclear disarmament, it places mankind on a dangerous brink, balancing between peace and war, and it turns space into an arena of nuclear confrontation. The way out is provided by honest and concrete talks on reaching an accord to radically reduce nuclear weapons on earth and on banning them in space."

Carl Sagan, well-known American astronomer:

"Probably the most critical moment in the development of American-Soviet relations has arrived, and it is necessary to show political will and breadth of approach to problems of peace and war and understand that we are talking of the final frontier beyond which lies the destruction of mankind. I agree with the Soviet scientists' conclusions that the 'nuclear winter' and mankind's 'climatic and genetic death' are not a product of the sick imagination of science fiction writers. I would like to emphasize in this connecting the increasing role and responsibility of scientists, who must act in accordance with their conscience, sound the alarm, and explain to politicians and the international community the dangerous consequences of nuclear conflict.

"We have no way out other than talks and renunciation of the arms race. In the past the Soviet Union and the United States have repeatedly found a common language in talks on limiting the race for nuclear weapons. It is a matter of displaying good will and striving for mutual understanding and the development of cooperation in the interests of our countries' peoples and in the interests of all mankind."

CSO: 5200/1322

GENERAL

TASS REPORTS U.S. SCIENTISTS ISSUE NUCLEAR APPEAL

LD162032 Moscow TASS in English 1752 GMT 16 Jul 85

[Text] Washington July 16 TASS -- TASS correspondent Aleksander Lyuty reports: A group of prominent American nuclear scientists, who took part in the U.S. "Manhattan Project" in the 1940's to develop the A-bomb, has issued a plea for every effort to be made to reduce and remove the threat of nuclear war.

In their appeal issued today in time for the 40th anniversary of the U.S. first testing of nuclear weapons, Hans Bethe, Victor Weisskopf, Philip Morrison, Cyril Smith, Robert Backer and Kenneth Bainbridge urged the Americans to join them in demanding such a policy as would provide for dropping the illusions that it was possible to achieve any military or political aims in a nuclear war or to protect the population from a nuclear attack.

The appeal called for deep cuts in the nuclear armories, strict compliance with the Soviet-American 1972 Treaty on the Limitation of Antiballistic Missile Systems, talks to ban anti-satellite weapons testing, and measures to prevent the proliferation of nuclear arms. A consistent and vigorous execution of such a policy, it said, would lessen the threat of a nuclear war and strengthen America's national security.

Weisskopf told a news conference that the Americans should learn to live in peace with other nations and that measures should be adopted to ensure security both to the United States and to the Soviet Union. It was vital to avoid any steps that would give an impulse to the nuclear arms race. The threat of a nuclear war was a common enemy of all, he said. Voicing his deep preoccupation with the administration's program for developing a missile defense with space-based elements, the scientist said those plans were extremely destabilizing and fraught with the threat of a dramatic step up in the arms race.

CSO: 5200/1322

GENERAL

PRAVDA WEEKLY REVIEW: GENEVA TALKS, CDE, SDI, ABM

PM161019 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Jul 85 First Edition p 4

[Vitaliy Korinov's "International Review"]

[Excerpts] A Realistic Course

The normalization of the world situation, establishment of relations of trust and mutual understanding between states with different social systems, and the elimination of the threat of nuclear war remains the sine qua non of international life.

A fierce battle rages around the solution of this burning problem. Aggressive imperialist circles are doing everything in their power to confine international relations within the vicious circle of confrontation, arms race, and confrontation which they are again foisting on peoples. But the vast majority of the planet's population resolutely rejects such a prospect. The policy of peace which the USSR and the fraternal socialist countries are consistently pursuing is inspiring peace-loving mankind with strength and energy in this noble battle.

The plans that the socialist community states are elaborating are not aimed at war and aggression. The preparations for the 27th CPSU Congress and the congresses of communist and workers parties to be held in the other socialist countries are taking place under the banner of the elaboration of peaceable creative plans for the period through the year 2000 and the longer term. The new edition of the CPSU Program to be adopted by the 27th congress looks far into the 21st century. The very scope of the USSR's economic plans "testifies to the peaceable sentiments of the socialist giant," the Japanese newspaper ASAHI noted. "Moscow needs a relaxation of tension and dialogue to implement its epoch-making plans."

The USSR and the other socialist community countries regard it as their international duty to do all they can to achieve a radical breakthrough in the course of international events and the revival and consolidation of detente. The supreme duty of governments and responsible statesmen is to tirelessly quest for every possible way of eliminating the danger of nuclear war.

The situation that has developed demands a courageous, innovative approach to the issues that feature on the agenda of international life. These questions cannot be resolved using yesterday's yardstick. A farsighted policy based on an understanding of the realities of the current epoch rather than on narrow-minded considerations of one-sided benefits and advantages (which furthermore are based on illusions) is

the true demand of our times. The CPSU and the Soviet state are implementing precisely such a policy. We are not discouraged by the fact that the enemies of international cooperation are stubbornly trying to erect barriers and obstacles in the path of the resolution of the burning problems of the present time. The persistence with which the USSR is putting forward realistic and constructive peace initiatives is all the greater.

It was the USSR that proposed to the United States that new talks be held in Geneva on nuclear and space arms and that persistent efforts be made to ensure that these talks proceed in a businesslike and constructive spirit. If the other side also acted in the spirit of the previously reached understanding, it would be possible, during the course of the endeavor, to prevent the militarization of space, to draw up mutually acceptable agreements on far-reaching, truly radical reductions in both sides' nuclear arsenals.

A genuine desire to return Soviet-U.S. relations to a normal channel also characterizes the USSR's approach to the issue of reaching agreement on the Soviet-U.S. summit scheduled for November. Unfortunately, this cannot be said about certain U.S. circles that have not given up their attempts to artificially exacerbate the atmosphere surrounding Soviet-U.S. relations. Certain Washington circles, for instance, are still advocating the continued pursuit of the "from a position of strength" policy despite the fact that the bankruptcy of this course is obvious. There is nothing that is further from the truth than the assumption that the colossal buildup of its military machine by the United States allegedly acts as an "incentive for talks with the USSR." The arms race can only increase the threat of war, whereas a sensible, realistic approach is needed for talks.

Avoiding the Fatal Step

"We must learn to think anew. We must ask ourselves not what steps we should take to achieve the military victory of the camp to which we belong, because such steps no longer exist, but rather another question: What steps can be taken to avoid a military conflict whose outcome will be catastrophic for all its participants?" These words written 30 years ago by Russel and Einstein, outstanding scientists of world renown, in their famous manifesto rang out again recently at one of Brazil's scientific centers where the 35th Pugwash Conference was taking place. The conference participants resolutely denounced the "star wars" plans that are being elaborated by the U.S. militarists.

At the same time, in another part of the world, a suburb of Stockholm, an international conference was being held under the title "Space Arms and International Security." Most of its participants in turn expressed profound concern at the prospect of the spread of the arms race to space. Great interest among the participants of this conference was attracted by M. S. Gorbachev's reply to an appeal by the influential U.S. public organization "Union of Concerned Scientists." The declaration that the USSR will not be the first to put weapons into space was received as yet another convincing confirmation of Moscow's allegiance to the cause of peace and the peoples' security. "The propositions contained in the reply accord with the thoughts of U.S. scientists," Professor S. Drell from the Stanford Research Center in the United States has said. "It is extremely important to preserve the ABM defense treaty currently in force. On the basis of this treaty it is possible to achieve strengthened security and eliminate the risk of war breaking out."

The USSR's adherence to the ABM defense treaty, just like all other agreements signed by the USSR, needs no confirmation. The Soviet Union is not developing space strike

arms, nor a large-scale ABM defense system, nor the groundwork for such a defense, but is strictly abiding by its obligations under the treaty. The attempts of the transatlantic peddlars of disinformation to label the USSR as the "violation" of the treaty are a typical example of brazen anti-Soviet slander.

The ABM defense treaty is a key component of the process of nuclear arms limitation and, naturally, peace champions resolutely oppose attempts to abrogate this most important document. The implementation of the "star wars" concept, H. Bethe, the prominent U.S. physicist and Nobel Prize Winner, warns, calls into question existing strategic arms limitation treaties and primarily the treaty on the limitation of ABM defense system. "The 'star wars' program means a serious escalation of the arms race and destabilizes the already fragile equilibrium of nuclear forces in the world." This is the view of more than 700 Canadian scientists and technical experts from 20 Canadian universities.

Protests against the plans of the U.S. militarists to transform space into an arena of war are also multiplying because people see that the Pentagon is simultaneously pushing ahead with the development, production, and deployment of other first-strike weapons systems such as the MX and Midgetman ICBMs, missile-carrying submarines, and strategic aviation. The United States has now virtually reached the point of adding another, even more dangerous type of barbaric weapon -- a lethal nerve gas compound -- to its military arsenal. Naturally, the barrage of protests against this policy is intensifying.

The advocates of space weapons have launched into feverish activity. They are trying to invent more and more new "arguments" in favor of the militarization of space. The disinformation and disinformation machine is working at full capacity. The latest "canard" in this respect darted out of the editorial office of THE NEW YORK TIMES in recent days. Referring to "ranking" Washington administration "spokesmen," the newspaper announced that certain members of the Soviet delegation at the Geneva talks allegedly "unofficially" let the U.S. participants in the talks know that Moscow no longer seeks a ban on all research work connected with the development of space weapon components.

Meanwhile the USSR's position is well known. The USSR is seeking agreement on a total ban on the development, testing, and deployment of space strike systems. The Soviet proposals that have been submitted to Washington provides for all work on the development of new antisatellite facilities to be stopped, and facilities of this kind already in the possession of the USSR and the United States to be scrapped, including those whose tests have not been completed. Thus the gentlemen who are trying to present the USSR's stance in a false light are playing with marked cards.

CSO: 5200/1322

GENERAL

SOVIET, U.S. SCIENTISTS DISCUSS ARMS ISSUES, BILATERAL TIES

LD181219 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1510 GMT on 16 July carries a 60-minute program entitled "Eliminate the Nuclear Threat" which consists mainly of a television link-up between Soviet and U.S. scientists in Atlanta, Georgia, and Ostinkino, Moscow, who discuss the nuclear issue in English with super-imposed announcer-read Russian translation. The discussion is chaired by Theodore Hesburgh in Atlanta, president of Notre Dame University. The other participants include: Carl Sagan (Atlantic), well-known U.S. scientist; Noel Gayler (Atlanta), retired U.S. admiral; R.Z. Sagdeyev (Atlanta), director of the USSR Institute of Space Research; and Georgiy Arbatov, director of the United States and Canada Institute in the Moscow studio.

Sagdeyev introduces the program by explaining that the meeting came about as a follow-up to a series on the nuclear winter threat which was broadcast by the CNN cable television company in the United States. He says: "Some U.S. scientists and a number of our scientists consider that a nuclear winter could in principle lead to the disappearance of mankind as a biological species." Sagdeyev then introduces the participants and goes on: "At the request -- at the suggestion -- of the U.S. participants we agreed that we should not touch on current political problems. We tried to keep to this understanding as did our American colleagues; but I think that for Soviet viewers who are quite well-grounded in politics, the political background of everything under discussion will be clear."

Sagan opens the discussion by noting the size of the nuclear arsenal and its overkill capacity.

Sagdeyev notes that everyone is threatened. Gayler says that joint action is imperative. Arbatov agrees with what has been said, adding that to date mankind has lived by the law of the jungle where force predominates but the threat of self-annihilation now calls for change. Arbatov goes on: "I would like to say that today people's collective common sense is becoming extremely important, for it is really essential to get away from stereotypes. This also means getting away from a number of the traditions which for many thousands of years have determined international conduct. I mean the old attitude to military might, to war, and so on. In order to get away from these traditions we must alter our view of many very important issues, such issues which have previously been considered -- I don't wish to offend anyone -- as sacred cows. This applies to such concepts as patriotism, for example." "Love of one's country must now mean avoiding nuclear war." Or, take security. Security can no longer be achieved at the expense of others, at the expense of your adversary or so-called adversary. Such can only be built jointly and this must be understood. We will survive or perish together. Or take realism: For many centuries someone who

relied on weapons was considered to be a realist; remember the term *realpolitik*. Realists were people who relied only on force, on a military force. But today it is difficult to think of anything less realistic or more illusory than the hope that problems can be solved by war. From this it follows that much in international relations and in the very approach to foreign policy must be changed. This is a difficult process, mainly a political process. Vested interests must be overcome. The burden of hatred, preconceptions and prejudice, the habit of dehumanizing the adversary must be overcome.

"Let me note that right now when Soviet-U.S. relations crop up as a topic, many Americans, even those who are positively inclined, including people who I deeply respect, put the matter in this way: An improvement in these relations is possible because the USSR, they say, is running up against such and such difficulties, in the economy, say. Well, first of all, who does not have difficulties in the economy? And secondly do we favor peace and disarmament because of difficulties? Why do they forget that we know very well what war means." The USSR suffered great losses in the last war and is seeking to prevent another one. "The main problem in my opinion is that not much time remains to eliminate the threat. I would formulate the task in this way: Either we destroy the weapons or the weapons will destroy us. Thank you."

Sagdeyev agrees that there is little time left and complains that the test ban treaty should include underground tests.

Gayler suggests various means for improving relations and destroying nuclear weapons. Arbatov says that he has discussed Gayler's ideas with him in the past and agrees with him. Arbatov goes on: "What can I add? Not from the military point of view -- for I do not consider myself a specialist here at all -- but from the political point of view. In January our countries agreed to resume talks on space and nuclear weapons. The fact that we agreed to do this is very good. But, at the same time, without a change in approach to what is being discussed, these talks threaten to become endless, fruitless, and possibly even harmful.

"If you will permit me, I shall return to the importance of the time factor. It seems to me that in a few years time -- it is difficult to say precisely when -- we might suddenly look round and find ourselves, one might say, in a talkless world, where talks and agreements have become impossible due to the development of military technology. On the horizon there are weapons systems that are unverifiable. Moreover, it will become immeasurably more difficult even to calculate what is a balance or equality when there are so many different weapons systems that are difficult to compare.

"In brief, we must hurry. It is important that the talks should produce results, that they should be supported by the appropriate policy.

However, if the arms race is further intensified and new weapons systems are created and military budgets are increased while the talks are in progress, then these talks will become a sort of tranquillizer, a means designed to calm people, and inspire in them the thought that everything is fine, whereas in fact we shall be moving further and further along this very dangerous path.

"I also think that it is impossible to hold talks in a vacuum. The idea did not turn out to be correct -- although it was prompted by the very best intentions -- that you can isolate talks on arms limitation from all the other problems of our interrelations and from the political atmosphere. We tried to do this at the end of the 1970's

because we hoped thereby to save a deteriorating situation -- not only to elaborate but also to ratify the SALT II agreement. But history shows that we did not succeed.

"We must understand that talks on limiting armaments are very difficult in themselves. Well, true, I suspect that at times these difficulties are deliberately exaggerated. But as I am not a specialist I cannot prove this. However, if one adds a bad political atmosphere to this natural difficulty, plus a total lack of mutual trust, then it becomes simply impossible to come to an agreement, for it is a matter of very important questions of security. To resolve them it is absolutely essential to have some trust, even in a minimum amount, in your partner who is, at the same time, your adversary, your potential adversary. Thus, we must think about all of this.

"By the way, Noel [Gayler] touched on these problems. Noel spoke about rhetoric, about the way in which one should not talk about the other. And I consider that in this sphere as in many others we have more grounds for complaint than you do. It also happens that some topic is thrown out to the public specially to distract it -- for example the need for a more than 100 percent verification of an agreement -- it is clear that this is impossible so nothing else is discussed. Or the question of the hot-line is raised, or the question of how to manage crisis situations. There is nothing wrong with some of these questions in themselves; they are important ones. But none of these can replace genuine disarmament, a serious reduction in armaments, an improvement in relations, a reduction in tension, the development of cooperation and mutual trust.

(Hesburgh breaks in and says): "Georgiy, I think that we all understand this. Perhaps the most amazing thing for our viewers who usually consider that every meeting of American and Soviet peoples turns into a quarrel is that we are holding a discussion without coming up against any considerable differences. Roald [Sagdeyev] over to you."

Sagdeyev responds, "Yes, I would like to say a few words about the problem of trust or distrust. Yes, we are potential adversaries, as has already been said. And therefore, we have many reasons not to trust each other. On the other hand, we have reasons to trust each other because we have a common enemy that threatens us both. It is a most menacing enemy -- the nuclear arsenals we have accumulated. I think that if we wish to get away from stereotypes we must understand that it is precisely this common enemy which is the stimulus moving us to trust each other to try to deal with this danger. It is precisely this which moves us to seek measures to build trust and I quite agree with the notion that cooperation in various spheres would be extremely important."

Sagan notes that any aggressor who unleashes a nuclear attack would be destroyed by the environmental consequences of that same attack. There are so many nuclear weapons in existence that reductions could be carried out for many years without reducing either side's security and both sides would gain. Many argue that aggression is inherent in man and can never be eradicated. The same argument was advanced over slavery and was proved wrong. Action must be taken now.

Arbatov adds: "I think that Carl [Sagan] uttered an immutable truth when he stressed that we have no other way out than to act. We have reached a critical point. Therefore, it is essential to understand this truth rapidly. We can no longer continue to act by trial and error. That is where the difficulty lies. We have lost the right to make mistakes. And it is very important that this has been shown by scientists who have revealed the consequences of nuclear war. This also applies to doctors. I think that

try deep changes have already occurred among the broad public, among the masses, in their concept of nuclear war, of the arms race in which there can be no winner and which promise only death." He says that too much money and effort is already being swallowed up by the arms race when it could be used to relieve hunger instead. "It is necessary to reach a level of understanding where the arms race, the demand for increased military expenditure and hostility toward other peoples becomes a bad policy dooming any politician to defeat. Then the position will change. I think that everyone should strive for this."

Sagdeyev notes some of the areas of science which would be aided by a diversion of effort away from the arms race. The four participants are given 1 minute each for a final summing up. Arbatov speaks first:

"Well, you know, the meeting is ending and as far as I know this has been the longest television meeting involving American and Soviet people. It is taking place at a very important time. I think that what has been said reflects what we think in general and undoubtedly what many others think. We have agreed that our interests demand a change in political conduct. It must be remembered that there have been many occasions in history when people and whole nations have acted contrary to their interests. But previously this was not a reversible process. It brought suffering but with time life returned to normal. If war is not prevented now this will be an irreversible mistake. And everyone has a vast responsibility. This must be understood."

Gayler says that only political will is needed to eliminate nuclear weapons. Sagdeyev says that he is optimistic that this political will can be found. Sagan concludes that nuclear war must be prevented.

CSO: 5200/1322

GENERAL

ITALIAN FOREIGN MINISTER DISCUSSES GORBACHEV'S MOVES,

PM081153 Rome LA REPUBBLICA in Italian 5 Jul 85 p 3

[Interview with Foreign Minister Giulio Andreotti by Alberto Jacoviello; date, place not given]

[Excerpt] [Jacoviello] Following your first meeting with Gorbachev immediately after his election as CPSU general secretary you said in an interview with LA REPUBBLICA that he would govern with confidence and authority. The recent changes in the Kremlin seem to prove you right. Be that as it may, what is your assessment now of Romanov's departure from the scene and of Gromyko's appointment as head of state?

[Andreotti] It seems to me that Romanov's departure from the scene implies an even more sharply defined transition to a new course. I recall that when I first visited the Soviet Union in 1972 Kosygin, then prime minister, told me that the man of the future was Romanov. His departure from the scene, then seems to emphasize the change to a new course.

Gromyko's position could be different, however, because the head of state, even in the Soviet Union, has a role dependent on the individual in question and not only on his institutional duties. I believe that Gromyko is still to be reckoned with, both in the Soviet Union and, through his dealings with heads of state, in international relations. His will not be a formal presidency, I believe. Nevertheless, it seems to me beyond question that Gorbachev is emphasizing his own will for reform -- decentralization on the one hand and centralization on the other, with regard specifically to the political leadership.

[Jacoviello] Nevertheless, I perceive the emergence of a tendency to consider others Gromyko's appointment a kind of retirement. It is as though you, minister, having hypothetically been elected president of the Republic, considered yourself retired.

[Andreotti] I believe there are some presidencies that are merely formal and others that are not. Let us remember that when Podgornyy visited Italy and I accompanied him to Turin the impression I gained was that of an essentially representative presidency. I do not believe, in view of Gromyko's accumulated knowledge and acknowledged skill, that he could confine himself to performing a merely protocol role. Furthermore, as far as I know, personal relations between Gromyko and Gorbachev are good.

[Jacoviello] So there is to be a Gorbachev-Reagan summit in November. What can legitimately be expected from it?

[Andreotti] Actually, I thought that the summit would take place after the CPSU congress because I believed that Gorbachev would present his entire platform in that forum and that the talks with Reagan would then take place on that platform.

But the meeting is being brought forward, which may mean that he does not want to keep everything in abeyance until next year. Furthermore, I believe that, being confident of dealing with an interlocutor who must be reckoned with -- and for some time to come -- in the Soviet Union, the U.S. President will be able to present a fairly clear argument, at least on one point which I consider important. That is, to give the Soviets an assurance that the U.S. military programs are not formulated and developed to force the USSR to do the same, thus undermining its prospects for economic and social development.

The Soviets' mistrust often has this psychological framework. I believe that the intention ascribed to the Americans is not real. But President Reagan's endeavor must be aimed primarily at convincing the Soviets. Indeed, if this psychological block is not removed, negotiations will remain very difficult.

[Jacoviello] But even most recently Gorbachev has not been slow to criticize the way the Americans are conducting the Geneva negotiations. How, then, has this meeting come about? Is it the first result of the Kremlin number one's greater security of leadership?

[Andreotti] Perhaps. But I believe that everyone has his own public opinions for which he must account. Furthermore, it seems to me that as far as Gorbachev is concerned this is part of a negotiating method -- to proceed from very distant stances and then to define a point of agreement. I must add, however, that as far as I am aware relations between the Soviet and U.S. delegations are not bad. In fact they are much better than they appear to be from what one reads.

[Jacoviello] In your opinion what is the most difficult aspect of the negotiations?

[Andreotti] First, there is no scientific definition of the plans that are supposed to make a nuclear attack entirely impossible. Apart from the various opinions about whether or not it is feasible, I see a major difference in the actual language being used by the two sides. It is a political language, not technical. The USSR says, basically, that what it is doing is defensive and not offensive and that what the Americans are doing is the opposite. So, much more preliminary work is needed. I still believe that scientists could have a useful word to say. I am not a fanatic but I believe, for instance, that this year's Erice conference could really help to improve preparations for the Reagan-Gorbachev meeting.

[Jacoviello] As things stand, what role could Europe play in facilitating a positive evolution of Soviet-U.S. relations?

[Andreotti] Europe can make a contribution in two ways. First, by attenuating the asperities and increasing the opportunities for dialogue. In this regard CEMA's initiative for comprehensive relations with the EC could be very important if such relations join, rather than taking the place of, relations between the USSR and the United States. The other way could be by stepping up cooperative scientific programs not only among EC countries but also between the EC and third countries. This would help to reduce the technological gap between the United States and Europe and thus reduce anxieties about an imbalance in asserting Europe's role.

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

DUTCH COMMENTATOR SEES NEED FOR U.S. CONCESSIONS IN GENEVA

Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD in Dutch 1 Jul 85 p 9

[Commentary by An Salomonson in the column "On the Other Hand": "Non-Nuclear Arms States of the World, Unite"]

[Text] In 2 months the 128 signatory states of the Nonproliferation Treaty will turn up in Geneva to study how the treaty has been complied with. In that treaty the non-nuclear arms states obligated themselves not to acquire nuclear arms, in return for peaceful nuclear technology. The nuclear arms states promised to negotiate on rapid and drastic arms control agreements.

The first promise has been kept. No new nuclear arms have been added to the list (although a number of countries are on the threshold). The second promise, on the other hand, has not been kept: the superpowers have reached no new agreements since the Salt I and ABM treaties of 1972. Salt II was never ratified. Nothing suggests that the Soviet-American talks in Geneva will produce any result in the foreseeable future.

This failure casts a dark shadow over the upcoming follow-up conference. The displeasure of the Nonaligned countries has in the meantime turned to such rage that it appears possible the Nonproliferation treaty will collapse. If the superpowers do not make an unambiguous gesture at the follow-up conference to show that they want to save the Nonproliferation Treaty and that they are serious about arms control, a whole series of Nonaligned countries could well carry out their threat to denounce the treaty.

Such a gesture can occur in only 1 sector as long as the bilateral negotiations are unsuccessful. That is in the area of a total test ban, a ban that is on underground nuclear tests (they are already forbidden above ground, under water, and in space). Such a ban is a relatively simple way of condemning the nuclear arms arsenals to a slow death by suffocation. Just as with things around the house, so too, you see, for nuclear weapons it is necessary from time to time to renew or replace them, because otherwise they become unusable with the passage of time. Keeping them up to date in this way requires test explosions. If they are banned, then the existing systems become untrustworthy, and new ones can no longer be tested. The weapons spiral comes automatically to an end.

There has been talk about a test ban ever since the Nonproliferation Treaty was signed in 1968. In the preamble it even calls for a test ban in so many words. For that reason it has gained symbolic significance. At the end of the 1970's negotiations on the ban were almost complete when the Americans broke them off unilaterally, officially in reprisal for the Russian invasion of Afghanistan, in reality probably because the political will was lacking.

Since then there has been a total impasse. The Soviets proclaim loud and clear that they are for such a test ban. Whether they mean that is difficult to test as long as the Americans are unwilling to talk about it. The latter argue that such a test ban is realistic only in the context of a broad arms control agreement. Test explosions can be done away with, they say, only when the entire disarmament process is well underway. Repeatedly the American government has declared that a test ban is not a priority and is considered only a long-term goal.

How much bitterness this has caused became clear at the end of last week (again) in Geneva, where Prince Sadrudin Aga Khan and his "Groupe de Bellerive" had organized a colloquium on nuclear proliferation as an introduction to the follow-up conference. There were speeches by VIP's like Arbatov, Anatoli Gromyko, Perle, Kennedy, Owen, Palme, Crown Prince Hassan of Jordan, former President Perez of Venezuela, the Egyptian Shaker who will chair the follow-up conference, not to mention our own Theo van Boven. Guest of honor was Vice President Bush. 500 politicians, UN officials, and non-governmental organizations participated in the discussion.

It was dominated by a single thought: only a test ban treaty can still save the Nonproliferation Treaty. As one man the speakers demanded (except of course for Perle and Bush) that the United States and the Soviet Union cross that bridge (together). The contrast this time was not between East and West or North and South. A broad front of non-nuclear arms states formed against the superpowers "that can murder all of us" (in Palme's words).

Naturally nobody believes that America will turn around from one day to the next. Washington and Moscow are much too far apart in their positions for there to be a substantial concession. Still, they must be very interested in stopping proliferation. Even a small, poor country can put a superpower in checkmate with a primitive nuclear weapon.

Even a small concession would satisfy the non-nuclear arms states at the follow-up conference. Such a concession might consist of a moratorium on tests of over, say, 10 kilotons; or of a unilateral promise not to carry out any tests for 1 year as a sign of good will; or of an exploratory mandate to the UN Disarmament Commission in Geneva for a test ban treaty (to prepare a negotiating mandate). Very modest concessions, as I said.

Activities like those of Aga Khan have no direct significance politically but do have an indirect one. They help to sensitize world opinion--and thus governments. All the delegations that will be leaving soon for the follow-up conference now know that the non-nuclear arms states will rise

in revolt if there is no concession on a test ban. And that in that case no consensus will be reached on a final communique, and that the follow-up conference will then end with the same setback as 5 years ago. It is just that this time that means the end of the Nonproliferation Treaty. Nuclear anarchy then lies before all of us.

President Reagan holds the Old Maid in his hand in this macabre game. He can take an oh-so-modest step in the direction of arms control. Or he can keep all his options for new weapons systems open. For new cruise missiles, so small that they are hard to count and thus cannot be verified. Or for laser beams in space, pumped up by a series of small nuclear explosions. In doing that he would not only be trampling on all existing arms control agreements, he would also be making new ones impossible and besides that undermining the Nonproliferation Treaty.

There was not much to laugh about in Geneva.

12593

CSO: 5100/2565

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

CSSR FOREIGN MINISTER ON UN, ARMS NEGOTIATIONS

AU012054 Prague RUDE PRAVO in Czech 28 Jun 85 p 2

[Report on speech given by Bohuslav Chnoupek, minister of foreign affairs and chairman of the Czechoslovak Commission for the Year of the United Nations and the International Year of Peace, in Prague on 27 June-- passages within slantlines published in boldface]

[Excerpts] Many things have changed in the world since the United Nations was founded. In particular, the international balance of forces has markedly changed. The number of members of this organization has more than tripled and totals 159 states at present. The number of socialist countries has also more than doubled. These nations, true to their international duty and the principles of Marxism-Leninism, consistently and unshakably defend the positions of world socialism and all progressive forces in the United Nations. They see to it that the composition and activity of the United Nations accurately corresponds to the political picture and the topical problems of the present-day world.

However, with the growing influence of socialism and progress in the world, the attempts of imperialism to torpedo the activity of the United Nations and its Charter have also begun to grow, under various pretexts.

From this angle we view the call to disband the United Nations and the attacks on the United Nations, UNESCO, and other specialized organizations. From this angle we can also view the component of militarist policy striving to achieve military superiority; to upset strategic stability; to further complicate already sufficiently complicated international relations; to speedily develop new, highly sophisticated weapon systems for the White House military plan in outer space; to continue to the third generation of first-strike nuclear weapons; to escalate the provocations of West German revanchists who, encouraged by this policy from the position of strength, have again been reviving the so-called openness of the German question and cast in doubt in connection with this year's 40th anniversary of the victory over fascism the weighty, international-legal Yalta and Potsdam documents, in which the allied countries--with a joint and undivided hand and at the price of the immense sacrifices in World War II--have firmly embodied the norms that determine the face of the present-day world and Europe.

We do not succumb to pessimism, however. We can proceed from the fact that the overwhelming majority of mankind and the governments of a great number of countries on all continents regard averting the danger of nuclear war, halting the feverish arms buildup, and maintaining peace throughout the world as the most important task. They welcome the Soviet-American negotiations in Geneva. They regard as constructive the proposal by Mikhail Gorbachev for a bilateral moratorium on nuclear and space weapons, which would allow further concrete proposals by both sides regarding the reduction of the size of nuclear arsenals, banning offensive space weapons, naturally. Now it is the turn of the American side, which should correct its positions and adhere to the agreement of 8 January 1985 on the interrelationship of the discussed issues.

However as Mikhail Gorbachev said on Wednesday, /should the USSR be confronted with a real threat from outer space, it will find a way to face it effectively, a matter no one should doubt./ Thus far only one thing is clear: The American program of the militarization of outer space prevents achieving appropriate agreements in Geneva. Talk about this program being "defensive" in nature is, of course, a fairy tale for naive people. When its partners at the Geneva negotiations continue their policy of protracting sessions, avoiding the solution of issues they have come to discuss, and using time to assert their military programs in outer space, on land, and on sea, then of course the USSR will have to reassess the entire situation. It simply cannot afford to have these negotiations used again for deceiving people and disguising war preparations, whose objective is to ensure the United States' strategic superiority and world hegemony.

We expect that during the upcoming 10th anniversary of the Helsinki conference, the participating countries will have the opportunity in the Finnish capital to again express their will to overcome the dangerous tension and launch a broad effort of peaceful cooperation in the spirit of the Final Act, and demonstrate the viability of the policy of reducing tension.

CSO: 5200/3066

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

PRAGUE VIEWS 'TRICK' OF BUSH'S EUROPEAN TOUR

LD071941 Prague Domestic Service in Czech 1630 GMT 7 Jul 85

[Commentary by Frantisek Vonderka]

[Text] U.S. Vice President Bush's tour of West Europe reminds us somewhat of the story of the guest who gets nice smiles from everybody, but sighs of relief from everyone when they see the back of him. George Bush came to visit the NATO allies with the idea of explaining to them the advantages of supporting President Reagan's plans for militarization of space, known under the abbreviation of SDI. The visitor from Washington claimed in the West European capitals that these three letters signify peace, strengthening security and improving defense and, inasmuch as some hosts appeared not to understand, he did not fail to add to his arguments in support of the militarization of space that--I quote--the United States and West Europe are now again facing one of their greatest political trials. In the meantime, even the most faithful West European allies are beginning to view the demands of the White House for further arms race as going too far, if only because they are still trying to find their feet after the powerful wave of opposition on the part of the public against the U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles in West Europe; and Washington is already proposing a new arms race.

Many politicians in West Europe also know at the same time that the words on the defensive character of the arms race in space are a mere trick. The so-called space protective umbrella is intended to guard the United States against a counterattack after deploying their own missiles, which is the reason for some of the allies asking what would happen to West Europe. The U.S. Vice President promised them that some kind of a smaller umbrella would open above them too.

In view of the technological parameters of the missiles in Europe, however--and many hosts realized this--he promised the impossible. That is why apprehensions were felt that the arms race in space would mean less security and more arms race. This prompted George Bush to declare that many West Europeans are literally blinded by their desire for peace so they cannot see what has to be done.

The question is why Washington is trying so hard to find the support of the West European allies for its space plans, why it is forcing them so vehemently into something that they do not like. Several reasons are at hand: it is true that it is fashionable in the White House now to talk about talks--on the other hand, however, they still have not given up the illusion that talks are possible from the position of strength. It is precisely this purpose that Reagan's space plans are intended to serve.

The White House would like to use the political support of the West Europeans as an argument at the USSR-U.S. talks in Geneva. The West European approval of Reagan's space plans should also remove in advance the responsibility from the United States for possible failure of these talks, it should represent some kind of an alibi for the White House. The pressure of Washington on West Europe, however, also has economic background: Washington's goals cannot be achieved by Washington alone. This is noted [unequivocally] by the report of the so-called Young Commission which states that the United States is continually losing its positions in the economic competition with other capitalist states, above all Japan. In electronics, for example, the United States has lost its position in 7 out of 10 most important branches on the world market. That is why the United States is now wooing the peak West European and Japanese concerns for coparticipation in the space arms race.

George Bush has brought back to Washington from his round trip a promise that the West European governments will not stand in the way of the firms which intend to participate in the militarization of space. The most important thing, however--that is unanimous political support for Reagan's plans--is still lacking, and, naturally, Washington is not happy about that.

CSO: 5200/3066

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

CSSR COMMENTARY ON 2ND ROUND HIGHLIGHTS SPACE ISSUE

LD152307 Bratislava Domestic Service in Slovak 1630 GMT 15 Jul 85

[Text] Second round of Geneva talks in Geneva on the complex of nuclear and space weapons will finish tomorrow. Jozef Knizat, an editor, has this to say on the subject:

The second round has neither produced progress nor has it been a cause for optimism. American propaganda, which is spreading shabby pseudoreports that the USSR has allegedly agreed to a research program connected with military space technology has been trying to generate such optimism. This has truly been a mere work of fiction by the American press, which wanted to create a semblance of what the United States has been doing its utmost to block--a positive shift at the Geneva talks.

The Soviet stand on this question is on the whole clear and categorical. It is necessary to proceed in accordance with the Geneva accord and tackle the issue of disarmament comprehensively, and, above all, to avert the militarization of space. In other words, the militarization of space must be nipped in the bud. However, the so-called research program not only foreshadows directly the existence of such a "bud," but practically creates conditions for its development in the military sphere. A test of components of a laser gun, the doubling of the sum for research work on offensive space systems in 1986, and the fact that as many as 800 companies are working in the United States on the militarization of space provide a clear and complete background to the destructive line taken by the United States in Geneva.

This line is to be given an even broader base. This was demonstrated in the recent West Europe tour by United States Vice President George Bush, a tour that foreshadowed a new, dangerous quality also in this area. The fact is that the American administration no longer seeks the agreement of West European governments for its "star wars" program but is instead orienting itself directly toward companies that manufacture high level military technology.

Japanese Prime Minister Nakasone's current talks in Paris, too, are significant from the viewpoint of the American strategy. As is known, Japan was the first country to voice her support for the American plans for the militarization of space. Now, Nakasone has voiced agreement with his country's share in the military aspects of the French Eureka program. Japanese technology and the simultaneous agreement with the "star wars" project and Eureka can create a dangerous bridge between both programs, and the intention of the American Government is precisely such.

This is not, however, the objective of the Geneva talks as formulated in the Soviet-American accord. The USSR must not only carefully monitor such realities but must also take practical considerations in the military-political area. In other words, unless the American attitude in Geneva is altered, the Soviet side will be compelled to reexamine its positions on this forum. The fact is that the USSR will logically not permit the Geneva disarmament talks to become a tool of a dangerous galvanization of American arms programs.

CSO: 5200/3066

SPACE ARMS

USSR'S ZHUKOV, VELIKHOV ASSAIL SDI AT WPC MARCH MEETING

Editorial Introduction

Moscow XX CENTURY AND PEACE in English No 5, May 85 pp 2-3

[Text]

Session of the WPC Presidential Presidium

The words of the headline are taken from the Declaration adopted at the closing meeting of the session of the WPC Presidential Presidium which took place in Moscow on March 22-25. These lines reveal the content and tune of the important international forum which gathered together about 400 representatives of different political parties, trade unions, public organizations, mass antiwar and liberation movements, unions of women, youth and religious elements from 86 countries, many international organizations.

The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet sent a greeting to the session's representatives.

The plenary meetings heard speeches by prominent political and public figures from various countries, messengers from all continents.

Fruitful discussions were held in special commissions and regional meetings on the following themes: "Historical Importance of the 40th Anniversary of the Victory over Fascism", "Prevention of Outer Space Militarization", "Struggle Against Aggression and Intervention in Different Regions of the Planet", "Problems of Developing Countries".

The participants in the session adopted the documents—Declaration and Appeal to the peoples of the world.

Zhukov, Velikhov, Molina Speeches

Moscow XX CENTURY AND PEACE in English No 5, May 85 pp 6-8

[Excerpt]

Lately participants in some Western antiwar movements, said Yuri Zhukov, the SPC Chairman, in his speech at the session, put a question: why the Soviet Union and other socialist countries react so actively on the so-called US "Space Defence Initiative"? That initiative envisages the creation of defensive not offensive weapons which, by the way, can appear only in the 21st century?

Doesn't that mean that the Soviet Union concentrating attention on the struggle against space militarization wants to divert the attention from the struggle for the reduction and liquidation of nuclear weapons which already exist, in particular, of the medium-range weapons being deployed in Europe? Maybe the Soviet Union has already abandoned the idea of their destruction and wants to preserve those monstrous weapons for the fulfillment of its aggressive aims about which warn American leaders?

As for the struggle for the reduction and liquidation of nuclear weapons in the long run, the assertions that we have lost or become less interested in it is a shameless lie. Not later than at the Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the CPSU held this March it was confirmed that our aim—complete destruction of nuclear weapons and full elimination of the threat of a nuclear war.

What we, peace champions, can and must do to resolve this problem without losing time for idle thinking?

First of all, I think it is necessary, using all possible things, to dispose the lie which is imprisoning now some participants in the antiwar movements who consider that the threat of war with the use of space weapons is the matter of a distant future and not actual. What we need now as air are publication of truthful information on the sinister plans, the information on the aggressive nature of "star wars"; meetings, conferences and symposiums with participation of specialists, and broad open discussions.

Further, we believe that it is necessary to show with new force that people are resolutely stepping up both against a war on earth and a war in

space. Deeply wrong are those who say that now when the Soviet-American talks has started and that their beginning is, undoubtedly, the great success of peace champions who long ago demanded the beginning of these talks—we, allegedly, can take breath and wait till positive results are obtained.

No to waiting! No to silence! No to demobilizing minds! On the contrary, we must now double, triple, increase by ten times, the pressure demanding that the participants in the talks respecting the will of the peoples must conduct them in constructive spirit trying to achieve the speedy agreement obtained as a result of the talks between Andrei Gromyko and George Shultz on the subject and aim of these talks and on the basis of the principle of equality and equal security.

Let streets be full of demonstrations of opponents of the arms race on earth and in space. Let them send their messages to the participants in the talks demanding the fulfillment of the will of peoples—prevent the militarization of space and use space only for peaceful purposes. May the delegations of peace champions be sent to Geneva for meetings with the participants in the talks and for handing in to them such messages.

I think it will be correct if a delegation of the present session of the WPC Presidium is sent there first to hand in the decisions which we adopted here.

Academician Yevgeny VELIKHOV explained the USSR position on the problem of space militarization.

Plans to develop a space-based anti-missile defense system, he emphasized, constitute one of the most burning problems of our day. The year of 1985 is a special year which may become a turning point in the destiny of the world. It marks the 40th anniversary of the Victory over fascism and also the 40th anniversary of the dropping of the A-bombs over Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

The present-day state of affairs in the world is such that, should we allow the deployment of one type of weapons in space, it is sure to be followed by another type and then still another. This will inevitably lead to a qualitatively

new round of the arms race—the arms race in space.

It is for this reason that groups of scientists in different countries were the first to take up a detailed study of the various aspects of the "star wars" programme and to explain them to the public at large. Among them were the Committee of the Soviet Scientists for Peace, Against Nuclear Threat (which has put out a special report on the subject and numerous publications), the Federation of the American Scientists, the Union of Concerned Scientists of the USA, and the Agency for Technology Assessment of the US Congress. Their conclusions can be summed up in the following way: plans to build an absolutely impenetrable spacebased anti-missile defence system are an illusion which cannot be supported by any modern scientific or technological concept. The expert conclusions based on an in-depth knowledge of the fundamental laws of nature and a comprehensive assessment of the situation in and prospects for the development of technology allow for no ambiguity or difference of opinion. They have been corroborated by forthright and convincing arguments.

Far from lessening the danger of a nuclear conflict, the "strategic defence initiative" aggravates it considerably.

This should, in the first place, be explained by the fact that even partial implementation of the "star wars" programme would in practice lead to the development of a first-strike weapon—its less ambitious but far more dangerous component. Specifically, the question at issue is the development of effective anti-satellite weapons, which would considerably undermine stability and the existing strategic balance and would spur the arms race still further.

Another dangerous aspect of the "star wars" programme is the fact that this movement towards developing a global antimissile defence system is a gross violation of the 1972 Treaty on Limiting the Anti-Missile Defence System which serves as a cornerstone of all subsequent arms limitation accords. In 1972, everybody hoped that the aforementioned treaty would be followed

by other similar agreements. But those hopes were not to be materialized. Let me stress again that the 1972 Treaty provides the groundwork for all further agreements in this field.

Third, further research and development of the "strategic defence initiative" in fact opens the "Pandora box" as it were, and gives the green light to the development of all types of space weapons systems.

Even if some practical results are gained after ten years of "research and development" in the field of space-based antimissile system (which is very doubtful), a fair amount of scientific and technical potential will still be built up in developing both the so-called "defence systems" and new and quite real offensive weapons. Let me re-emphasize the main premise that a space-based anti-missile system is an illusion but even the initial stages of its development pose grave danger.

First, it is extremely difficult to supervise and control the development of individual elements of a space-based anti-missile defence system. Second, in critical situations it is hard to rely on these elements, whereas their highest reliability is an indispensable condition. Third, individual elements of a space-based anti-missile defence system are exceedingly vulnerable, as they have easily perishable parts, the lack of which renders the entire system utterly inoperative.

Effective anti-satellite systems are being developed "under the blanket" of an anti-missile defence system, which jeopardizes the existence of vitally important satellites used for communication, supervision and control. Meanwhile the country's entire defence and security system is based on the existence of these satellites.

The development of an anti-satellite defence system, as the first stage in implementing the space-based anti-missile defence system programme, is, beyond doubt, a highly dangerous factor of destabilizing the existing strategic balance, fragile as it is.

According to the US administration's plans, the spacebased anti-missile system, which is being developed on a lar-

ge scale, should have the "police functions" that would enable the United States to "exercise control" throughout the world. Let it be recalled that the US harboured similar illusions in 1946, and the results are only too well known.

This is why it is important already now, without delay, to insist on and work towards:

- precluding militarization of space,
- adhering to the principles and provisions of the 1972 Treaty on Limiting the Anti-Missile Defence System,
- banning "research" within the framework of the "strategic defence initiative".

President of the Venezuelan Peace Council Ricardo Molina told the session that deployment of weapons in space is direct threat to the countries of the "Third World".

Not long ago an American scientist, military specialist, said that the USA was building a space shield to unsheath a nuclear sword, i.e., to deliver the first nuclear strike and remain unpunished. The star dreams of President Reagan and his supporters—let cities of other states be burning under US missile strikes while the American territory remains intact. But that will never happen. American cities will inevitably

be destroyed together with Soviet, Polish, Hungarian and German cities. The trouble will reach the most remote neutral countries and snowfalls don't recognize borders.

A reference should be made to the danger which carries the deployment of space weapons for the "Third World" countries too. They, naturally, will be unable to build anti-space systems and will be quite defenceless and left on the mercy of the Pentagon and CIA, which with the aid of space systems can destroy manpower, depots with ammunition and fuel, put out of action communication systems and power stations. In other words, they can use the most sophisticated and almost detective-proof means to perpetrate a pitiless aggression against any developing country.

International community is firmly against the escalation of the space arms race. Let President Reagan know that his "heroic dream" concerning "star wars" will be a nightmare for the whole of mankind and that nuclear weapon, land- or spacebased, is not a weapon but a means for suicide. Only ignoramuses and maniacs don't understand that.

SPACE ARMS

DELEGATES FROM 15 COUNTRIES DISCUSS ARMS CONTROL

AU071424 Paris AFP in English 1406 GMT 7 Jul 85

[Text] Stockholm, July 7 (AFP) -- Delegates from 15 countries today ended a three-day conference on space weapons and arms control which reflected sharp disagreements between the Western and Eastern blocs.

The parley, sponsored by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, an independent body financed by the Swedish parliament, brought together some 60 experts, scientists and politicians in Saltsjobaden, south of here.

Soviet academician Andrey Kokoshin asserted that Washington's "star wars" space-based defense research project was the main obstacle to any rapprochement between East and West.

Former U.S. Defense Secretary Robert McNamara said arms control was a political and strategic issue, not a scientific one, pointing out that no arms control agreement had been developed since the 1972 SALT II strategic arms limitation treaty between Washington and Moscow.

Klaus Citron, the West German delegate to the Stockholm conference on disarmament in Europe, meanwhile said that arms control was meaningless if it did not take into account all weapons, wherever they may be deployed, to prevent all types of wars.

Speaking on behalf of the Third World, Indian delegate Mujkund Dubey said he opposed any idea of deterrence.

CSO: 5200/2696

SPACE ARMS

FRG'S CHANCELLERY SCHAEUBLE ON SDI PARTICIPATION

DW120959 Bonn DIE WELT in German 12 Jul 85 p 1

[Guenther Bading report: "SDI Research Will Not Cost Bonn a Pfennig"]

[Text] Bonn -- In an interview with DIE WELT, Wolfgang Schaeuble, head of the Chancellery, warned against a misguided discussion of the allegedly high costs of FRG participation in the Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI]. Washington and Bonn are aiming for a framework agreement to ensure cooperation between U.S. and FRG firms. He said that the result is that the FRG, as a state, will not participate in SDI research.

Schaeuble noted that from the very beginning, and again during a conversation with Chancellor Kohl when he visited Bonn, President Reagan indicated that he is interested in involving FRG and European firms in the research, and that his government would be the sole contractor and thus also the financier. At the time, Reagan spoke of participation on a "company to company" level. Schaeuble said that the idea of putting the participation of firms in SDI research within the context of framework agreement between the states was viewed "positively" by the United States. However, he stressed, these agreements must be negotiated bilaterally. In Washington's view, U.S. negotiations with Europe on a supranational level do not make much sense. Schaeuble said he could imagine a "model agreement" that could be concluded between the FRG and the United States and that could be adopted by other governments that have a positive attitude toward SDI.

The purpose of such agreements would be to resolve the issue of technology transfer. Following his talks with U.S. Vice President Bush in late June, the chancellor clearly told the CDU/CSU faction that the results of SDI research must be available equally for exploitation by the United States and the participating European nations. Since this cannot be ensured by individual participating firms in their dealings with their U.S. partners or with the U.S. Government, FRG firms logically have a considerable interest in a framework agreement between the two countries. Schaeuble said that it was not true that one had to decide between the U.S. SDI program and the European technological cooperation plan Eureka. However, he noted that while Eureka is planned as a civilian project, there are some aspects that approach military research. At the summit meeting in Milan, Schaeuble said, we proceeded on the assumption that such European research should be compatible with SDI. In his above-mentioned remarks to the CDU/CSU faction, the chancellor also said that U.S. strategic defense research and technological cooperation of the Europeans can be "linked."

Minister Schaeuble questioned the view that Eureka would create something like a European counterpart to U.S. research work. In implementing multinational projects, national egotisms too often play the decisive role, he said. An example of this is the project of a European fighter aircraft -- the so-called Fighter 90 -- on which no decision has yet been made.

With regard to CDU/CSU caucus chairman Alfred Dregger's suggestion that Europe participate in SDI research work on the basis of an additional program for ground-based defense against the specific threat to Europe by short- and intermediate-range missiles, Schaeuble said that this thought could not yet be considered to be the declared policy of the U.S. Government. An exchange of opinions on this matter should be continued soon, he added.

FRG-U.S. talks on SDI should enter a concrete phase in late August or early September, he said. After the preparatory talks by Teltschik, the chancellor's foreign political adviser, in Washington in June, a mixed commission will go to the United States. Schaeuble said he hopes that U.S. views on participation and on a possible frame work agreement will have be concrete by then.

CSO: 5200/2698

SPACE ARMS

FRG TRADE UNION STATEMENT ADVISES AGAINST SDI

DW111115 Bonn DIE WELT in German 11 Jul 85 p 1

[Guenther Bading report: "DGB on SDI: The Soviets Have Been Researching for Long Time"]

[Text] Bonn -- The DGB obviously intends to act during the discussion on the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) as it did during the debate on NATO's two-track decision. A "statement" by the DGB Executive Board takes a negative approach and advises the Federal Government against supporting the U.S. plans. However, the Executive Board's document takes pains not to be seen as one-sided or blind toward Soviet efforts in this field.

Similar to former DGB Chairman Vetter's remark at the special congress in Duesseldorf in March 1981, that "whoever says Pershing, must also say SS-20," the statement points out in connection with the U.S. plans that are limited to research work, that the Soviets have been very active in this area. "The Soviet Union has also been performing research work for a long time on the intensified military use of space," the document says. Thus, the DGB Executive Board members indirectly indicate their annoyance over the fact that Moscow has been pursuing this research work secretly and for a "very long time." The Soviet Union made "this subject an issue for arms control polity discussions only after the SDI program pointed to a possible lead by the United States," the document says.

The DGB opinion by no means supports Chancellor Kohl, who has called the SDI project justified. However, it points out that Washington's justification mentions getting away from deterrence through the threat of mutual destruction. The document says: "The SDI program is receiving moral backing because it is considered as being exclusively defensive." The DGB Executive Board maintains that what is decisive is not the classification of individual weapon systems as defensive or offensive, but the general structure of weaponry and military doctrine. In this connection the trade union representatives maintain that the SDI will violate the strategic balance. The probable consequence will be a "round of arms buildup of unparalleled dimensions," the document says.

Following phrases similar to those in SPD statements on the SDI about alleged negative effects on special FRG interests, the old demand of a "security partnership" with the Warsaw Pact is raised. "The SDI rejects the principle of common security that ought to be supported and promoted in view of existing nuclear potentials." It is striking that the DGB and the SPD increasingly are beginning to replace the formulation about security partnership with the term "common security."

SPACE ARMS

FRG RESEARCH MINISTRY DOES NOT HAVE FUNDS FOR SDI, EUREKA

DW101043 Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU in German 10 Jul 85 p 6

[Report signed "GD": "No Money for SDI Research"]

[Excerpt] Bonn, 9 Jul -- Research Minister Heinz Riesenhuber (CDU) does not have the funds in his 1986 budget for the European technological cooperation project (Eureka) that has been proposed by France. Riesenhuber said that his funds were "fully spoken for." If greater amounts are need for Eureka in 1986, the finance minister must allocate additional funds, he said.

According to Riesenhuber, the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) does not threaten to place a burden on his budget. This project "is not" included in the Research Ministry's budget, he stressed. The minister objected to the charge by the SPD opposition in the Bundestag that he has restricted his financial leeway to too great a degree by participating in expensive space research programs, such as the Ariane V booster and the U.S. space shuttle, Columbus.

CSO: 5200/2698

SPACE ARMS

DREPPER SEES GERMAN PARTICIPATION IN SDI AS INEVITABLE

Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE in German 12 Jun 85 p 5

[Article by Karl Feldmeyer: "Western Europe Should Not Become a Reduced Security Zone/Drepper: American and Soviet Missile Defense Systems Cannot Be Prevented"]

[Text] Bonn, 11 June. The establishment of effective missile defense systems by America and the Soviet Union could not be stopped by the West European countries, the chairman of the CDU/CSU caucus in the Bundestag, Drepper, stated in a conversation with this newspaper. The establishment would radically change the strategic situation of the two world powers and also that of the West European nations. For that reason, the question will come up again as to how the large conventional superiority of the Soviets can be neutralized and the creation prevented of a new serious threat to the West European nations by those nuclear weapons which--such as atomic artillery, aircraft, and cruise missiles--escape destruction by a missile defense system. At issue was the stability and the neutralization of the partial Soviet superiority when the deterrence effect which previously emanated from the second strike capability of the intercontinental missile forces no longer existed. The question facing the European NATO partners was not how to prevent the establishment of missile defense systems, but only how they would most quickly influence this development in their favor. In his opinion, this could be done sooner through cooperation than through refusal.

In Washington during the preceding week, Drepper had discussed the questions related to the establishment of missile defense systems, especially the on-going SDI research program, with American Secretary of Defense Weinberger, the Chairman of the National Security Council, McFarlane, as well as politicians of the Democratic and Republican parties. During those discussions he had gained the impression that the SDI research program was no issue between Republicans and Democrats. A Democratic president, he was assured, would also carry the SDI research program to its conclusion. What it would eventually lead to would then depend on the results of the research, he was assured several times. "The doubts circulating through our country, as reflected in the formulation 'Who knows what the next president will do,' appear to me to be unfounded. Finessing and lamenting are of no use here. It is a fact that the world powers are doing research in this direction," said Drepper.

The necessity for participating in the American research efforts in one's own interest is viewed by Dregger as compelling. "What alternative do we Germans have, after all--there is no Europe from the security politics standpoint. There is no European identity and no nation in Western Europe which would be prepared and able to assume the role of the Americans for us Germans. From de Gaulle to Mitterrand, the French have always declared that the "force de frappe" protected only the sanctuary of France. The French are pursuing national defense policies. They are, to be sure, preparing for the possible commitment of French troops in Germany for forward defense purposes, but in wartime they alone would decide whether this commitment takes place or not. Nor do they let us participate in the target planning for their nuclear weapons, even though in wartime these would be employed from German soil--this or the other side of the zonal border. By so doing they deny us something in which the Americans have for a long time permitted us to participate in the nuclear planning group of NATO. Nor are they willing to station French nuclear weapons on German soil. This position is not based on considerateness, mind you, but rather it is a signal that Paris is not prepared to take nuclear risks for the protection of Germany. All this shows: Our most important partner in security policy is and will continue to be the United States. Our security is predicated on the security partnership with that country. I see no acceptable alternative in a security partnership with the Soviet Union," Dregger added.

This state of affairs should not be lost sight of for a single moment. It was the main reason for SDI's being not only of military-strategic, technological and economic importance, but rather a project of the greatest importance in an alliance-political sense. He hoped that as many European countries as possible would take part in the research program of the Americans. Nor did he want the FRG to be singled out by being the only country among all European partners to accept the American cooperation offer. "But," Dregger added, "more important than being singled out is that Western Europe does not become a reduced security zone, in other words, assumes a singular role in its entirety. For that reason, Europe must at an early date adapt itself to basic military conditions which will change radically in East and West through the installation of missile defense systems." stated the chairman of the CDU/CSU caucus.

Dregger outlined the possibilities which he perceives for a participation in the SDI project. He had proposed to Weinberger and his closest assistants Ikle and Perle the creation of a consultative council to consist of the American government and those European governments prepared to support the SDI research program. "After some hesitation," his conversational partners had promised their willingness to take up and deepen this idea. The hesitation was justified, in Dregger's judgment, "since the European governments have thus far only rarely shown themselves to be constructive.--Here, now, there is at least a point of departure. It is up to the governments to make use of it. My main concern was that the discussion between America and Europe can finally become concrete. Thus far fog has prevailed on both sides. And that is not good for the alliance. The Europeans can only approve or reject if they have concrete options. To propose such options is up to the Europeans, for it is their interests that are at stake," Dregger opined.

When asked what form the cooperation with the Americans could take, Dregger named two starting points. For one thing, the Europeans could concern themselves with the specifically European threat, i.e. with defense against medium range and short range missiles as well as cruise missiles. The other point of departure would be one based on qualifications, i.e. the Germans and other Europeans would take over portions of the overall project for which their research and industry were especially well qualified. In both cases, the consequence would be that the participating European governments, in coordination with the Americans, finance that portion of the research project for which they assume the responsibility, and that they unilaterally assign the required tasks to their research institutes. This would mean that they could then also make use of the research results and any patents that might grow out of them. The technology transfer--insofar as it applied to the civil use of the research results--would then take place in line with the principle of "Do ut des" ["I give in order that you may give"], said Dregger.

If this did not happen, it could be anticipated that the Americans would turn directly to the best European research institutes and assign to them directly the tasks in which they have an interest. The European could in that case still complain, to be sure, but they could no longer participate. Nor would they then be able to profit from what is achieved in their research institutes with American funding. Dregger indicated that he had expressly warned the Americans against this development and its foreseeable consequences. If Europe were to get the impression that the Americans were interested only in their own security and the exploitation of European research capabilities, this would then promote anti-American reservations. "The Americans would then have lost the battle for the soul of Europe. Nor could this be prevented in Europe by those who view an intact alliance as necessity for survival," Dregger said.

12689

CSO: 5200/2662

9 August 1985

SPACE ARMS

DUTCH PAPER HOPES FOR EUROPEAN REJECTION OF SDI

PM031509 Amsterdam DE VOLKSKRANT in Dutch 21 Jun 85 p 3

[Editorial: "Star Wars"]

[Text] For the first time since President Reagan invited his European allies to cooperate in his immense project for a space shield against strategic missiles, the Second Chamber yesterday debated the strategic Defense Initiative, or star wars. As the debate demonstrated, it is difficult to talk of any enthusiasm in The Hague for this offer.

Defense Minister de Ruiter delivered some philosophical speculations to the air, and the rest of the cabinet did little more than listen, while waiting for the decision on a stance later this year. The left wing simply made statements of opposition. The People's Party for Freedom and Democracy advocated caution and had no reservations about the research, which in itself is still neutral and which will lead to decisions affecting Western and in particular West European security only in the nineties. An ironic approach which seems to shy too far away from earthly realities.

The Christian Democratic Appeal [CDA] declared in suitably strong terms that really no one on this side of the ocean is sitting and waiting for a project that brings with it great risks for the stability of global relations. That could lead to yet another arms race and, even with a measure of success, would put Europe in a more dangerous position.

The CDA also took a negative view of the technological possibilities. European participation--which would have to be joint participation--was weighed down with so many CDA conditions that an eventual "no" from the CDA parliamentary groups seems very likely. At least, if the CDA continues to adhere to this stance--one can always hope.

The signal given in this debate must be clear enough to the government not to allow it too much room for maneuver in West European consultations. The strategic and political disadvantages of the project are crystal-clear and the technological possibilities, on closer inspection, seem disappointing, as the government admitted. In fact general support was voiced for the French proposal for nonmilitary European research in the field of the newest technologies--"Eureka."

As was generally stated, Washington is out seeking political support for star wars much less than technological contributions from Europe. And to the extent that these contributions will be permitted, the revenue from this technology seems modest, because the danger of a "brain drain" to the detriment of Europe's own technological expansion must never be lost from sight.

It could be a thorny question whether a real prospect of significant technological possibilities could justify participation in a project susceptible to value judgments due simply to its cost and with considerable international political risks. But that prospect does not exist, and if the U.S. approach exhibits the same character in the coming months then there really is reason enough for a clear and ideally joint West European "no."

CSO: 5200/2697

SPACE ARMS

CANADA STUDIES PARTICIPATION IN SDI

Nielsen on Private Firms

Toronto THE SATURDAY STAR in English 1 Jun 85 p A19

[Text]

OTTAWA (CP) — Defence Minister Erik Nielsen says it would be a "terrible impediment" to free enterprise if the federal government told private companies they could not participate in the American Star Wars research program.

The Canadian government has not yet decided whether it will accept the American invitation to participate in the \$26 billion research program into a space-based, anti-missile defence system.

Even if Ottawa rejects the invitation, it can't force private companies to go along with its decision, Nielsen told the House of Commons yesterday in response to a question from Liberal MP Lloyd Axworthy.

"What he is asking the government to do, if I understand him correctly, is to put a total ban on any trading relationship, particularly in the research and high-technology area, between Canadian companies and the United States in connection with the (Strategic Defence Initiative)," Nielsen said.

Creative role

"There has never been any impediment . . . for Canadian companies to enter into contractual relationships with firms in the United States and the U.K. and Japan or anywhere else for that matter," Nielsen said.

External Affairs Minister Joe Clark made similar comments in Winnipeg on Thursday.

"We have a free market economy in Canada and we can't do much about it . . . but we made it clear (to the United States) that any step beyond research would be subject to negotiations."

Clark's comments drew sharp criticism from Axworthy and Manitoba Premier Howard Pawley.

"Canada shouldn't join the program," Pawley said. "Canada can do so much more by providing an imaginative and creative role in mediating international differences, peacekeeping and maintaining its credibility."

Axworthy said Clark should ask the U.S. defence department not to award Star Wars contracts to Canadian firms until the government makes up its mind on the issue.

Yesterday, Axworthy said Clark's comments make a "total sham and mockery" of past government statements.

Clark has said a decision could come by late summer or early fall.

Clark Assurance on Committee

Ottawa THE CITIZEN in English 13 Jun 85 p A12

[Text]

The Canadian Press

External Affairs Minister Joe Clark says he sees "no circumstances" which would require the government to decide whether to participate in Star Wars research or enter into a new trading arrangement with the United States before Aug. 23.

That assurance, contained in a letter to government House Leader Ray Hnatyshyn dated Monday and read to the Commons Wednesday, cleared the way for creation of a special parliamentary committee to study foreign relations.

Both the Liberals and New Democrats were threatening to boycott the committee because they anticipated the government would make decisions on Star

Wars and free trade — the two key issues on the current foreign policy agenda — before the committee could hold public hearings and make recommendations.

All three parties now have agreed to participate in the joint Commons-Senate committee which will examine broad foreign policy questions contained in a government discussion paper released last month. A final report is due May 31, 1986.

The committee will begin work this summer, Hnatyshyn said, and make recommendations on bilateral trade with the United States and the American invitation to participate in Star Wars space-defence research — formally known as the strategic defence initiative — by Aug. 23.

Second Parliamentary Committee

Ottawa THE CITIZEN in English 18 Jun 85 p A13

[Text]

A second parliamentary committee may be studying the Star Wars anti-missile system proposed by U.S. President Ronald Reagan.

The Commons committee on external affairs and national defence has been ordered to conduct hearings on defence co-operation with the United States in advance of the renewal of the Canada-U.S. agreement on North American air defence (NORAD) next May.

A special foreign relations committee of MPs and Senators is already charged with the Star Wars study as part of a more general review of the Conservative government's recent green paper on foreign policy.

But unlike that group, the external affairs committee also has authority to travel to the United States, and chairman William Winegard, Conservative MP for Guelph, Ont., said a visit to NORAD headquarters in Colorado Springs will likely be on the agenda.

As well, he said his group will likely pay particular attention to bases in Canada's north. Hearings will likely begin in the fall.

He speculated that the committee would pay more attention to "space vigilance rather than Star Wars itself," especially since Star Wars is more specifically under study by the foreign relations committee.

SPACE ARMS

AUSTRALIA'S HAYDEN SAYS CONCEPT UNDER CONSIDERATION

BK151323 Melbourne Overseas Service in English 1110 GMT 15 Jul 85

[From the "Australian Insight" program moderated by Tony Hill]

[Text] The American secretary of state, Mr George Shultz, has just completed talks in Canberra with Australian Government ministers. The talks are in some way the replacement for the regular council meetings between the members of the ANZUS alliance. Those meetings have lapsed since the third ANZUS partner -- New Zealand -- banned nuclear ships from its ports. One product of the talks has been the reemergence of the issue of Australian support for America's Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI], or "star wars" program. John Lombard in Canberra has prepared this report on the talks, which began with a short ceremony by Mr Shultz and Australian Foreign Minister Mr Hayden:

[Begin recording] [Lombard] After a 10-minute public ceremony, the two leaders went into closed session for the rest of the day. But not before noting the absence of the third partner of the ANZUS alliance -- New Zealand. Although in his opening remarks Mr Shultz did not refer specifically to the New Zealand decision to refuse port facilities to American warships, the secretary of state delivered what was clearly a message directed at the New Zealand Labor government.

[Shultz] Today, there are some who say that our alliance is not needed because this region is at peace. But if there is peace, it is in large part because of this alliance and the other alliances of the western democracies. It is not because there is not threat to peace. Soviet military forces have grown steadily and disturbingly over the last 20 years, not only in Europe, but closer at hand -- in the northern Pacific, along the Chinese border, in the Southeast Asia, and around the Indian Ocean. Fortunately, the United States and Australia have not sought to opt out of our commitment to one another, and to all those responsibilities essential to peace and security of the West. In remaining true to our values, we are able to produce results that are profoundly beneficial to ourselves and to the entire region.

[Lombard] At the end of the day's talks, a 4-page joint communique said Mr Hayden and Mr Shultz had agreed that ANZUS was of continuing importance, and they both hoped that an early return to the full range of trilateral cooperation between Australia, United States, and New Zealand might be possible. At a news conference, Mr Shultz was asked how soon that might be possible:

[Shultz] Well, it is hard to say. We .. [changes thought] the door is certainly open, and there are all sorts of ways to work around this problem. But we have to remain very firm on our worldwide policy of not confirming or denying the presence of nuclear weapons on any ship.

[Lombard] As well as talks with Mr Hayden, Mr Shultz had an unscheduled meeting with the prime minister, Mr Hawke. At it, Mr Shultz raised with the Australian leader the American SDI -- or the "star wars" concept as it is better known. Mr Hawke has publicly expressed Australia's opposition to SDI, and the Labor Party, particularly the left wing, has made clear its strong opposition to any Australian involvement in the SDI research. But Mr Shultz used the meeting with Mr Hawke to provide the government arguments about why the United States is pursuing the "star wars" research.

[Shultz] I did leave with Mr. Hawke and also Mr. Hayden, and I think also Mr. Menzies, a copy of a recent address made by Ambassador Paul Nitze that devotes itself exclusively to the Soviet SDI program. And I think in addition to other considerations having to do with this matter, it is important for people to focus in, as Ambassador Nitze does, on exactly what it is the Soviets are doing. And I think when you read Ambassador Nitze's address you will get a better idea of that, and I think it is a sobering exposition.

[Lombard] Paul Nitze is the special adviser to President Reagan and Mr. Shultz for arms reduction negotiations, and in his paper he spells out just how far the Soviet Union has gone in its SDI research. At the news conference, Mr. Hayden was asked if the Nitze paper had altered Australia's reservations about the SDI.

[Hayden] Prime Minister Hawke said earlier this year in Washington that we do not endorse the SDI concept. The matter is under consideration by the .. [changes thought] or full consideration by the cabinet. When this submission is brought to the cabinet by [words indistinct] you have the responsibility. We will consider our position, and we will formulate a reply to the defense secretary -- to Weinberger's invitation to us to participate in that research.

[Lombard] Mr. Hayden and Mr. Shultz also discussed Australia's proposal for a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific. This will be brought up at the meeting of the South Pacific Forum in Cook Islands next month. At the news conference, Mr. Hayden explained details:

[Hayden] We discussed it: I leave Mr. Shultz to make any observation from the American side. We discussed the principles of the nuclear-free zone for the South Pacific. Essentially they would prohibit the storage, manufacture, stockpiling, testing of nuclear weapons in the territorial areas of signatory governments. They will not prohibit governments determining, as a matter of sovereign rights, whether they will allow facilities to be used, such as ports or airfields -- we do that, and we will continue to do that. They do not interfere with, because they cannot interfere with the rights of aircraft or surface [word indistinct] and naval vessels to use international airspace or waterways. We will be bringing forward a draft of the treaty at the meeting of the Pacific Forum. What is decided then as to what direction the countries proceed in, whether they decide to sign or they decide (?this will not work) is something for the countries participating in the conference on that occasion to determine then.

[Shultz] We found the points that were made in the meeting, which were an elaboration of what Mr. Hayden just said, to be reassuring. We will be interested in receiving the text of the draft treaty. We think this is the kind of thing that has to be approached with great care, so we will study the text; and at the same time, we do see that our friends from Australia have gone about this in a careful way.

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

PRAVDA HITS U.S., NATO PRESSURE ON NETHERLANDS

PM221307 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Jul 85 First Edition p 5

[Vladislav Drobkov article under the rubric "Our Commentary": "Erecting a Palisade"]

[Text] The Hague -- As though to match the weather, statements at the height of summer by certain statesmen of the NATO countries frequently contain very warm assurances of the North Atlanticists' readiness for some "positive steps" in the matter of curbing the nuclear missile race in Europe. Perhaps people in the alliance have finally realized that the endless buildup of nuclear arms on the European continent and the deployment of new American medium-range missiles there merely create an additional threat to the security of the peoples living there? Alas, there has been no such "reappraisal of values" in the North Atlantic bloc. The facts indicate the reverse: The United States and its most bellicose allies are continuing at an accelerated pace to turn West Europe into a launch site for American Pershing II and cruise missiles, first-strike weapons.

At the same time the accelerated deployment of more and more medium-range missiles is accompanied by increasing pressure on the Netherlands. After Belgium, whose government has even so let American cruise missiles into the country, this is the "last bastion" resisting a similar Pentagon demand. As is known, the Netherlands Government has not yet given its final consent to the deployment of 48 cruise missiles envisaged in the 1979 NATO decision. The very broad protest movement which developed against nuclear missile escalation carried decisive weight here.

Millions of this small country's inhabitants participate in antimissile demonstrations. Numerous regions and major cities in the Netherlands have been declared nuclear-free zones. The leading opposition parties come out against the American "cruise death." And there is no unity of opinion on this question in the ruling coalition. Assessing the situation, the Netherlands realize that new missiles will in no way bring additional security but, on the contrary, will increase the threat of catastrophe.

In this connection NATO is bending over backward to make the Netherlands accept the weapons. NATO and American emissaries have stepped up their visits here. U.S. Vice President G. Bush, who recently visited The Hague, and envoys lower in rank have un-animously called for "Atlantic solidarity to be shown." Indoctrination is carried out by very different methods: from arm twisting at NATO sessions to the dissemination of malicious fabrications about an "increasing Soviet threat."

The pressure on the Netherlands and the attempt to drag one more country into the missile adventure totally demolish NATO's assurances of its desire to curb the nuclear arms race. Erection of a missile palisade, with whose help the United States hopes not only to achieve military superiority in Europe but also to turn its allies into the Pentagon's nuclear hostages, is continuing behind a screen of "love of peace."

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

USSR: U.S. MISSILE, BOMBER DEPLOYMENTS IN EAST ASIA

PM231020 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 20 Jul 85 Second Edition p 5

[Own observer A. Golts "Military-Political Review": "Militarist 'Geometry'; Pentagon Bludgeoning Asia; Why Washington Is Knocking Together an Aggressive 'Triangle'; The Real Route to Stability and Security"]

[Excerpt]

Numerous statements by administration spokesmen make it possible to posit the existence within the administration of a kind of "Pacific doctrine." Washington claims that it is based on the idea of coordinating economic cooperation among the Asian and Pacific states, cooperation which will allegedly bring them unprecedented prosperity. However, the military-political provisions of this doctrine boils down to the United States needing to achieve total hegemony in this part of the world. At the same time, East and Southeast Asia are seen as a suitable springboard for striking against important economic and political centers in the USSR and the other socialist countries.

On that basis, the Pentagon is cramming the Asia-Pacific region with nuclear weapons and their delivery vehicles. The latest missile-carrying submarines equipped with ballistic missiles carry out combat patrols around Asian shores. The deployment of various types of cruise missiles is in full swing: They are fitted to B-52 strategic bombers and 400 Tomahawk sea-launched cruise missiles are carried on ships of the 7th Fleet -- submarines, battleships, cruisers, and destroyers. Judging by statements by Pentagon leaders, the U.S. military department intends in the near future to fully undertake the deployment of the "winged death" directly on the territories of the Asian states of Japan and South Korea and, possibly, in a Southeast Asian country.

Some 2,000 nuclear munitions are already in the region, according to foreign press figures. The U.S. strategists intend to use F-16 fighter-bombers, which are also nuclear-capable, as kind of supplement to the cruise missiles. Two squadrons of these planes with a range of over 1000 km are already in South Korea. The Misawa Air Base in northern Japan has currently received more than half of the 50 F-16's intended for deployment there.

Nor have the Pentagon men forgotten about chemical weapons. A chemical munitions plant is currently under construction on Johnston Atoll in the Pacific, where one of the largest stockpiles of U.S. toxic substances is located.

Alongside the concentration of mass destruction weaponry throughout the entire region, an infrastructure of long-range communications stations, command centers, air and other bases, depots, and so forth is being hurriedly created and expanded. Thus, according to Japanese press figures, a central command center has been created at Misawa for running combat operations involving nuclear and chemical weapons in the northwestern Pacific. In addition, next year construction will begin near the Yokosuka Naval Base of a control center for U.S. nuclear weapon-carrying ships.

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

USSR MILITARY JOURNAL ON FRENCH, UK NUCLEAR FORCES' NATO ROLE

Moscow KOMMUNIST VOORUZHENNYKH SIL in Russian No 5, Mar 85 (signed to press 19 Feb 85) pp 82-86

[Article by Lieutenant Colonel V. Roshchupkin: "Exempt in the Accounting," "The Nuclear Forces of England and France in NATO Strategy,"]

[Text] A column of several heavy trucks accompanied by buses with security guards and motorcyclists departs a facility in southern England each month and makes its way to the main road and heads for Holy Loch Bay. This is the way the English publication NEW STATESMAN describes the picture of the secret delivery of nuclear warheads....

Let us now recall that American atomic-powered submarines are based in the vicinity of Holy Loch. According to the above-mentioned NEW STATESMAN, the Pentagon has more than 100 bases and other military facilities of various types, including nuclear facilities, located throughout the British Isles. At Bentwaters, Woodbridge, Alconbury and other American bases on British soil bombers of the United States Strategic Air Command (SAC) with nuclear weapons on board remain in constant readiness. With the deployment of American first-strike missiles they are also making their appearance at the base at Greenham Common and, according to press reports, will soon arrive at Mulsworth.

After the passage of 30 years, London has recently made public some official British government documents from the year 1954. From these documents we learn that even back then, the sober-minded members of the cabinet were extremely alarmed by the aggressive, adventurist course being taken by London's senior NATO partner, Washington, which was trying to push the planet to the brink of war. People on the shores of the Thames were already speaking of the serious danger that "the Americans will push things to a confrontation with the Soviet Union and that because of what they are doing we could see the start of a nuclear war."

Even W. Churchill, an unbridled anticommunist and one of the troubadors and organizers of the anti-Soviet "crusade" against the young Soviet government, and then a herald of the "cold war" in the postwar period, was alarmed by the possible consequences of the nuclear course being steered by the American ship of state and by Washington's persistent efforts to draw London along in its wake. "England has doomed herself to a position as a target," Churchill declared with the appearance of American nuclear bases on British soil.

It is doubtful, however, whether at that time even such a patriarch of British politics as Churchill, who had already stood at the helm for many years at that point, could have imagined that three decades later the British government would not only be giving its unconditional support to the nuclear strategy of the U.S. and NATO, but also that it itself would be engaged, heedless of the costs involved, in an intensive buildup of its own lethal potential. Every month the column of trucks referred to at the beginning of this article delivers nuclear warheads to Holy Loch not for American, but for British submarines. And these deadly charges are not being made overseas, but rather in Britain's own death merchants in factories in southern England....

One of the postulates of NATO doctrine has it that the "security" of the countries of the bloc can be guaranteed only by the superiority of their combined nuclear strength and the decisive contribution of the nuclear forces of the U.S., as well as by their readiness to use nuclear weapons first. England joined the nuclear club in 1952. And then in 1960, when France first got its hands on nuclear weapons, a "triple alliance" of sorts took shape within the framework of NATO.

In recent years the policy of the ruling circles of both the U.S. and the North Atlantic bloc as a whole has increasingly revealed a desire at any price to destroy the existing military balance between the USSR and the US and the Warsaw Pact and NATO. Washington and its partners want to be able to act from a position of strength in each and every situation and to dictate their will to others, and this, as has been the case many times, includes at the negotiating table. Current US military doctrine calls directly for the United States to establish itself as the No. 1 military power. The concept of military superiority determines the content of all actions the American government takes and the demands it places on its allies. And it is precisely with the objective of achieving military superiority that programs have been outlined which provide for increases in strategic offensive forces, both nuclear and conventional, as well as for additions to the military capabilities of both the US and NATO overall.

In order to justify these unprecedented preparations in the eyes of their own people, the governments of the West will frequently resort to camouflage and a number of cunning expedients. Among other things, they will always try to milk the myth of the "Soviet threat" and the military superiority of the USSR for everything they can. Comrade K. U. Chernenko stressed in a recent appeal to French readers on the occasion of the publication by Plon of the book Narod i partiya ediny [People and Party United] that it is precisely those whose policy does represent a threat to the entire world who are trying to lead their people down the wrong path. They are suggesting that it is USSR which represents the military danger. But to say this is to forget history and overlook the real facts of life as we face them today.

The fact is that between the USSR and the US, between NATO and the countries of the Warsaw Treaty, there is today a rough strategic military parity. And this, incidentally, has been and remains the view of prominent political figures in the West and is confirmed by the analyses of foreign military experts.

But apologists for the nonsensical notion of Western military superiority entrenched on both sides of the Atlantic are not inclined to proceed on the basis of the principle of parity and equal security. The Atlanticists have their own

system of computing troop and weapon strengths—computing by elimination, a militarist, NATO-weighted system of computation. One of the propaganda tricks which NATO politicians and strategists as well as the mass media resort to most frequently consists in the following. In their effort to employ all possible devices to frighten their people with the menace of Soviet medium-range missiles and the military strength of the USSR overall, U.S. and NATO leaders and Western propagandists will always leave the English and French nuclear weapons out of their calculations and pretend that they simply don't exist.

What NATO is trying to do here is to insinuate into the minds of the millions of West Europeans the idea that it is both "legitimate" and "essential" to begin to deploy the new American missiles. It cannot be forgotten that Washington's stubborn refusal to take account of the English and French nuclear forces was one of the reasons the talks on the limitation of nuclear weapons in Europe broke down.

Another one of the West's propaganda tricks is to insist on the "independent," "national" character of the English and French nuclear forces. But the statements of NATO political and military officials themselves, as well as those appearing in respected Western publications paint a different picture. In a large-scale war, the NEW YORK TIMES points out, the British nuclear forces "would be immediately integrated into NATO." Moreover, we can hear direct threats ring from the pages of an official English document—a government "White Paper." Here in black and white we see written that Britain's nuclear forces, an "integral component of NATO's nuclear potential," are capable of "inflicting such damage on the Soviet Union that the Soviet leadership has to take them into account."

Now as far as the French nuclear forces are concerned, we see from top secret American intelligence documents cited by the WASHINGTON POST that French missiles are targeted on our country. France's signature, too, is to be found on the NATO treaty, and in accordance with the provisions of this document, in case of the outbreak of an armed conflict it is to act jointly with the other states of the North Atlantic bloc. And in this case, observers point out, it is not going to be important whether Paris becomes part of the organization of the bloc or not. General B. Rogers, supreme commander of the combined armed forces of NATO in Europe, has stated unequivocally that in case of war, France will join forces with NATO "very quickly." So there's your "independent" "national" nuclear forces!

So, to go on about how the English and French missiles cannot be included in the overall European nuclear balance is demagoguery of the purest sort. For while American weapons do constitute the basis of the Atlanticists' nuclear strength, the atomic arsenal of England and France is certainly substantial as well. The nuclear weapons which these two countries possess are a reality which simply cannot be ignored. They exist, they are targeted on the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries and, as the Americans themselves say, their role is to supplement U.S. forward-based nuclear weapons. This is a threat which has to be taken into account and which must be responded to. The missiles of England and France are kept in readiness to deliver hundreds of nuclear warheads to their targets. Let us now go into this in a little more detail.

The nuclear forces of Great Britain and France are based upon military formations capable of employing strategic nuclear weapons. These weapons comprise part of the arsenals of the strategic nuclear forces of both countries. We are referring specifically here to 162 English and French ballistic missiles. They are to be employed primarily in the conduct of a general nuclear war, more specifically, for the purpose of delivering strategic nuclear strikes. It is precisely these weapons which, in the view of military experts, are held to comprise the most important component of the armed forces of England and France and which are given the greatest amount of attention. Expenditures for improving existing and the development of new strategic weapon systems are always increasing. In the event of a general nuclear war, the strategic nuclear forces will operate in combination with the general-purpose forces.

Great Britain has built and organized its strategic nuclear forces, as well as its armed forces as a whole, in accordance with the military and political policies London is pursuing as well as with NATO's aggressive nuclear strategy. Characteristic of these policies is the reliance on nuclear weapons and a willingness to be the first to use them.

Precisely of what, now, are the strategic nuclear forces of Great Britain comprised? They include units and formations of the Vulcan medium strategic bomber (56 aircraft) and atomic-powered missile-carrying submarines. These four vessels, the Resolution, Repulse, Renown and Revenge, also constitute part of the combined armed forces of NATO and alternately conduct combat patrols. Each submarine is armed with 16 Polaris-AZ ballistic missiles, which have a range of up to 4600 kilometers. Each missile carries three warheads. According to the press, there are 192 nuclear warheads in missiles carried by English submarines aimed at targets in the USSR.

Speaking of Britain's nuclear navy, it should be pointed out that, while it is inferior to the U.S. Navy, it nevertheless has no equal among the navies of the other capitalist states. In the view of military experts, the British navy is capable of performing a substantial range of military missions both in a general nuclear missile war and in limited wars, that is, missions which do and missions which do not involve the employment of weapons of mass destruction. Confirmation of this can be found in press reports that during the Anglo-Argentine conflict in the South Atlantic, the destroyer Sheffield and other British combat ships were carrying nuclear weapons.

These weapons, moreover, could have been detonated at any moment. It was only by a fortunate stroke of luck that the nuclear weapons on board the Sheffield did not explode when the ship was struck by a missile. Another ship tried to remove at least a part of these weapons from the Sheffield but was unsuccessful. The English destroyer went to the bottom with its entire arsenal of nuclear weapons....

The ruling circles of Great Britain have devoted and continue to devote particular attention to the upgrading and building up of their offensive nuclear forces. The modernized Polaris ballistic missile, which now carries no longer three, but six warheads, is being added to their submarine arsenals. It is the view of English military officials that this will add substantially to the strength of their strategic naval nuclear forces. Then plans for the 1990's call for the

deployment of the Trident-2 missile on nuclear submarines; this is a missile which will carry eight warheads with greater range and accuracy. The British press has reported plans to build a new base for these Trident missile-carrying submarines on the River Clyde in Faslane (Scotland).

The decision to modernize the atomic submarine fleet was made in 1979. At that time it was estimated that to buy the missiles from the U.S. and build four atomic-powered submarines would cost 5 billion pounds sterling. The SUNDAY TELEGRAPH now points that inflation and the decision to buy an improved version of the missile have now doubled the original estimate. The introduction of a submarine fleet armed with the Trident will increase the nuclear strength of the British forces many times virtually overnight. All this is clear evidence of the aggressive nature of British military doctrine, which has already revealed its true nature in London's military adventure in the Falkland Islands. The British government takes the position that the country must have its own "modern" independent nuclear "deterrent."

But we have just seen the price it is going to pay for this "independence." As journalists have accurately pointed out, this is the independence of the American boot on English soil. For the fact is that a guidance system is required to launch a Trident, and as the press emphasizes, the English cannot provide this guidance without the support of American satellites.

It comes as no coincidence that the program for modernizing Britain's nuclear forces with American Tridents has drawn the criticism of some in London from whom it would never have been expected. Lord Carver, former chief of the general staff of the British army, for example, has referred to these billions in expenditures on an American missile system as "a mistaken selection of priorities." "As far as Great Britain is concerned," J. Silkin, minister of defense in the Labor "shadow" cabinet, writes, "no matter which way we look at the problem, there is no sense in which we can say that she has an 'independent' nuclear force. We can pretend we enjoy this independence, but, of course, we don't really have it."

But the Tory government pays no heed to the voices of sanity. Like the senile old British lion, unable to give up age-old ambitions of empire, always ready to jump east when Uncle Sam waves his militarist whip in that direction, its threatening roars will be heard more and more often.

Prime Minister Thatcher has declared openly that she "would not hesitate to push the nuclear button to launch Polaris missiles in the case of a military conflict in Europe, even if that would lead to the destruction of Britain." So judging by all this, it looks as though nuclear ambitions and anti-Sovietism have become ingrained so deeply in the ruling circles of England that with all the heedlessness of a card player, they are prepared to stake the fate of their very own country on a single card.

The English man in the street, however, has different ideas. Despite the intensity of efforts to whip up a poisonous fog of militarist, anti-Soviet hysteria over an already foggy Britain, many have been disturbed by the prime minister's remarks. For example, John Brown, a Royal Air Force veteran who participated in the landing of Allied assault troops in France in June 1944,

sent a letter to the editors of MOSCOW NEWS, an English-language newspaper published in Moscow, in which he sharply condemned the highly aggressive nuclear ambitions of official London.

Here is part of what Brown wrote:

"In the first place, Mrs. Thatcher is forgetting that she can speak for roughly only a third of the country. Secondly, those on our small island who recall the battles for Stalingrad, Kursk, Moscow and Berlin have not forgotten that it was thanks to these victories that we ourselves were not trampled under the SS boot and that there were no Auschwitzes and Buchenwalds at London, Liverpool and Glasgow. These Britons, or at least most of them, know that the Soviet people are our friends, friends who saved us at the cost of the lives of 20 million of their fellow citizens.

"Most Britons also understand that if Mrs. Thatcher does push that god-awful button there will be instant retaliation, and within only a few minutes the British Isles will cease to exist."

Among Englishmen who think like World War II veteran John Brown there is also widespread sympathetic understanding for the point of view of the USSR, as has been put forth by Comrade K. U. Chernenko at a meeting in the Kremlin with N. Kinnock, the leader of the Labor Party of Great Britain. The Soviet Union wants to see Europe completely rid of both medium-range and tactical nuclear weapons, on the basis, of course, of the principle of equality and equal security for the countries of both the Warsaw Pact and NATO. The Soviet Union would be prepared to reduce and then physically eliminate the same number of medium-range missiles it has in the European part of the USSR that would correspond to the number of nuclear missiles destroyed by the English side.

If Britain would implement a policy of complete nuclear disarmament and eliminate the corresponding foreign bases, it would be creating conditions under which the USSR would guarantee that it would target none of its nuclear weapons on British territory. If Great Britain decides to commit itself officially to a policy of nuclear disarmament, the entire range of questions which would arise in this connection concerning Soviet-British relations in the military sphere could then become the subject of discussions and a corresponding agreement between the USSR and Great Britain.

This is a clear-cut, constructive position. How will London respond to it?

The Albion Plateau. This green, hilly area in southern France is very picturesque and literally breathes tranquillity. But below this green blanket stand steel-reinforced launch silos which have been hardened against a nuclear blast. Each one of these silos contains a nuclear missile with enough fire power to wipe a fairly good-sized city off the face of the Earth.

According to foreign press reports, this is the main base for France's nuclear forces. During the late 1970' and early 1980's, France was developing its basic plans in the area of nuclear missile systems and its armed forces modernization program overall in accordance with a six-year "military program for development of the armed forces for the period 1977-1982." France's strategic nuclear forces, which have the third most powerful nuclear arsenal in the world, now include

strategic weapon systems. The nuclear forces comprise 44 Mirage medium bombers, 18 medium-range, surface-to-surface ballistic missile launchers and 5 atomic-powered submarines with 16 launchers each. These vessels have the following specifications: displacement (surface) - 7500 tons, underwater displacement - 9000 tons, surface speed - 20 knots, submerged speed - 25 knots, effective weapon range - up to 3200 kilometers.

At the end of June 1982 France launched its sixth nuclear missile submarine, the Inflexible. It will take its place in the operational inventory in April 1985. According to official reports, this vessel is "more powerful, quieter and more effective." This new submarine will carry 16 3-stage missiles with a range of 4000 kilometers. It is currently undergoing trials. According to the new defense program for the period 1984-1988, France's strategic nuclear forces will have 7 nuclear missile submarines by 1990. The total number of missiles will rise to 130, while the number of nuclear warheads will increase seven-fold to 690. These figures do not include the aircraft designed to carry nuclear weapons.

In remarks on the occasion of the launching of the Inflexible, the French prime minister declared in connection with the Soviet-American nuclear arms limitation talks then under way in Geneva that Europe was seeing a "growing imbalance in the areas of both conventional and nuclear weapons in favor of one of the superpowers." The country he had in mind? The Soviet Union, which, he said, was "threatening both Europe and China." This statement obviously has absolutely no relationship to reality whatsoever. Has not this been used to justify the policy imperialist circles have followed in increasing the level of nuclear tension in Europe, in attempting to achieve military superiority, in building up their own nuclear potential? And what are we supposed to make of the statement made at the very same ceremony that "there can be no negotiations" involving the French nuclear forces?

On the banks on the Seine you will hear people discourse at length about the "special" nature of the national nuclear forces. At the end of January 1985, Ch. Hernu, minister of national defense once again spoke of their "independence." At the same time he pointed out that "the security of France is based on cooperation with the other countries of Western Europe" (i.e., NATO-V. R.). In making this declaration, Ch. Hernu reiterated the position of Paris, namely, a refusal to include the French nuclear forces in the coming Soviet-American negotiations.

Is it possible that the people on the banks of the Seine have forgotten that as long as 10 years ago, back in 1974, at a session of the North Atlantic Alliance council in Ottawa, the nuclear forces of France were referred to in documentary black and white as a coequal component of the NATO nuclear force?

France's missiles, as is attested by her military experts, enable her to pursue a "strategy of strikes against urban areas." And which urban areas? No big secret is ever made of this, of course. Soviet urban areas. As the noted political scientist R. Aron acknowledges, when people in Paris talk about "detering the Soviet Union," what they are talking about is the "ability to drop a few bombs on Moscow or Leningrad." And these, it turns out, are the objectives targeted by the missiles on the Albion Plateau and aboard the French submarines, whose patrol areas are agreed upon with the American military command!

In February 1985 the American press cast some light on how France was modernizing and building up its strategic forces. It wasn't able to get along without its Uncle Sam. *NEWSDAY* referred directly to the fact that France's nuclear arsenal is growing with the direct support of the United States. This ominous cooperation is based on a secret agreement concluded between Washington and Paris in 1978. In 1982 the Reagan administration and the Mitterand government reached agreement on the practical details involved in implementing the agreement. The United States has supplied the French with eight of the most advanced Cray-1 computer systems. And it is precisely these computers, as *NEWSDAY* emphasizes, which have played a most important role in France's nuclear multiple warhead-missile development program.

And as for Paris? Foreign nuclear debts have to be repaid, first and foremost in the military-political sphere. As the press has reported, in return for U.S. help in building up its strategic strength, the French government has agreed to increase its cooperation with the NATO military organization. It has also taken "a number of steps in support of Reagan's policy toward the USSR." The country's advocates of the much-celebrated "Atlantic solidarity" have become much more vociferous now. To the accompaniment of the anti-Soviet propaganda orchestra, they are coming out for the installation of new American missiles in Western Europe, a military modernization program for the NATO countries, production of neutron weapons and stepped up military preparations generally.

But the fact is that Western Europe is already larded with nuclear weapons. For every 50 American soldiers stationed there there is one warhead equivalent in power to the bomb dropped on Hiroshima. So why, one would ask, the need for any more?

The method the Atlanticists use to compute NATO's nuclear weapons—write one, carry two—is simply not in line, because it gives a distorted picture of the balance of forces on the continent of Europe and, in the final analysis, worldwide as well. This question has now become a particularly urgent one in view of the Soviet-American nuclear and space weapons talks beginning on March 12 in Geneva.

A. A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and USSR minister of foreign affairs, responded recently to questions put to him by political observers by emphasizing once again that the English and French nuclear weapons must be included in the calculations. England and France are part of the North Atlantic Alliance. It would be in the highest degree unjustifiable for the North Atlantic Alliance to get this kind of a break, this little extra, a prize, if you could call it that, in the form of the English and French nuclear weapons. The Soviet Union is taking a firm position based on principle in this question, a position based upon the principle of equality and equal security for the parties.

Discharging their patriotic and international duties to stand in defense of the security of our country and our friends and allies, the fighting men of the Soviet armed forces and their comrades-in-arms in the fraternal armies of the Warsaw Treaty countries continuously remind themselves of the growing military threat posed by the aggressive circles of NATO. The Atlanticists are giving pride of place in their menacing preparations, in addition to the nuclear forces of Eng-

England and France, to the new American Pershing-2 and cruise missiles. To maintain a state of high vigilance and continuous combat readiness and to be able to divine the treacherous schemes of our enemies—these are the missions with which the Communist Party has charged the Soviet armed forces. This is a duty to the generations bygone, which in the bitterest of wars defeated the most dangerous of all mankind—Hitlerite fascism. The Soviet fighting man has no higher duty than to stand in defense of the fatherland which in the fiercest of battles our fathers once defended.

COPYRIGHT: "Kommunist Vooruzhennykh Sil", 1985

8963

CSO: 1801/211

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

USSR: FRG MISSILE DEVELOPMENT SHOWS NUCLEAR AMBITIONS

LD241648 Moscow TASS in English 1629 GMT 24 Jul 85

["Bonn's Nuclear Ambitions--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow July 24 TASS -- By TASS news analyst Valeriy Vavilov

The Bundeswehr's nuclear-tipped Pershing 1a missile will be replaced with a more advanced weapon, the Pershing 1b, according to an official spokesman for West Germany's Defence Ministry.

The newspaper FRANKFURTER ALGEMEINE quotes him as saying that Bonn thus fulfils the commitment of the European NATO partners to prepare weapon systems for use of nuclear warheads.

What is this weapon system? The West German Air Force maintains two squadrons armed with 72 "obsolete" American-made Pershing 1a missiles which do not differ by their operational and technical characteristics from the West German-based missiles of the 56th Field Artillery Brigade of the U.S. Army (precisely these missiles in the American Army are now being replaced with Pershing 2 medium-range missiles designed to make a first nuclear strike, including at the Soviet Union).

The range of the new West German missile is up to 750 kilometres. It is capable of carrying a nuclear warhead with the TNT equivalent yield between 60 and 400 kilotons (the yield of the atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima was 12.5 kilotons) and hit targets with greater accuracy. Entire territories of Poland, Czechoslovakia and the German Democratic Republic fall within its range.

By starting the modernization of its missile force, at an astronomical cost of 1.8 billion marks, Bonn is making yet another adventurous step towards acquiring nuclear weapons, while ignoring the pledge not to accept from any one nuclear weapons or control over them, and not to produce and not to acquire them in any other way, which is contained, by the way, in the nuclear non-proliferation treaty. It is empty talk to claim that the Bundeswehr command has no right to dispose of nuclear warheads, the use of which is controlled by the Americans: The missiles can deliver not only conventional, but first of all nuclear weapons. The West German service personnel undoubtedly undergo training in handling nuclear devices. They in Bonn point out in this connection their "nuclear participation", demonstrating the readiness "to share with the partners all burdens and all risks" within the NATO framework. In this way the "deprived" (of nuclear weapons) country intends approaching the "nuclear button", seeking the "right to take part in decision-making" on using nuclear weapons.

The Pershing 1b is intended, according to NATO's concept, for making "selective nuclear strikes at targets deep inside enemy defences." This is one of the stages in the so-called "limited nuclear war" that would result in a global nuclear catastrophe.

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

FRG CHALLENGES TO LEGALITY OF PERSHING-2 DEPLOYMENTS NOTED

PM011047 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Jun 85 Morning Edition p 5

[Vikentiy Matveyev "Political Observer's Opinion": "What the Trial in Frankfurt-am-Maine Showed"]

[Text] Following the decision by a court in Nuremberg which determined, with regard to the case of the blockade of a U.S. military base by a group of peace champions in the FRG, that such actions are not illegal, a court of the first instance in Frankfurt-am-Maine recently made an even more notable decision. It examined the case of participants in the antiwar movement in the FRG who in December 1983 took part in the symbolic blockade of the access roads to the U.S. military base in Hausen--a suburb of Frankfurt-am-Maine.

The court was in no hurry to pass judgment. The circumstances of the case were thoroughly examined. The result? The participants in the symbolic blockade were vindicated. Judge R. F. Jahr, who handled the case, decreed that the FRG Government's decision to deploy Pershing 2 nuclear missiles on West German territory contradicts the country's constitution.

The prosecutor tried to dispute the decision's legality. But the judge relied on the opinion of experts and well-known scholars--Prof C. F. von Weizsaecker, brother the present FRG president, and (Kh. Afkheldt) from the M. Planck Institute.

Previously other eminent West German scholars--lawyers, physicists, and sociologists--had expressed themselves in the same spirit. A notable suit was brought to the FRG constitutional court in December 1983 in connection with the deployment of the Pershing 2 missiles in the country by five scholars--the lawyer (V. Doybler), the physicist W. Febhardt, information technology specialists (K. Kheffner) and (E. Zikman), and the lawyer (V. Shteynmyuller). Those who brought the suit pointed to the NATO military preparations on the country's territory which contradict the FRG Fundamental Law and which are expressed in the creation of an information technology system making it possible to wage nuclear war. The question of the degree to which the deployment of the Pershing 2 and cruise missiles violates the constitution was not examined in the suit. Attention was focused on the measures accompanying these steps and intensifying the threat of the unleashing of conflict. From the viewpoint of the FRG Fundamental Law the handing over to the U.S. President of exclusive

powers with regard to the use of nuclear weapons from FRG territory, the suit said, is intolerable. Those who brought the suit dismissed allegations that the FRG could be the victim of either military or political blackmail by the USSR or any other country.

The FRG constitutional court did not accept the suit and did not uphold it. The West German organs of justice at this level sanction the government's actions. But it is becoming increasingly hard, not easier, for them to do so. Opposition to the Pershings and cruise missiles is being stepped up. Considering the feelings of their flock, clergymen in the FRG and other West European countries consider it essential to dissociate themselves from the nuclear missile fever in NATO.

Cardinal Salvatore Pappalardo, chairman of the conference of bishops of Sicily, spoke out early this year against the deployment of U.S. missiles on that island. Earlier the Church of England in Britain had urged all nuclear powers to renounce first use of weapons of mass destruction. The Catholic and Evangelical churches in the FRG are reluctant to support the government unconditionally in its dangerous course.

Why are we noting the clergy's stance in this connection? Because it is indicative of processes taking place in the Western political sphere caused by the implementation of Washington's new militarist plans. Now we can speak not only of demonstrations by broad strata of the public, trade unions, and antimilitary groups and organizations against the U.S. Government's course but also of the crystallization of opposition to it at a new level. It is a case of state and legal and some other institutions in Western European countries, in this case the FRG, which are distancing themselves from the riskiest aspects of the NATO course.

The author of this commentary is not making out that what we desire is reality. There is notable evidence from influential U.S. press organs confirming that it is a case of processes in the countries which are the United States' NATO allies which are obliging Washington's government departments to sound the alarm.

In mid-February this year THE NEW YORK TIMES reported that the Pentagon and the State Department 'are trying to elaborate a policy countering the negative attitude which the allied Western countries have toward virtually any activity connected with nuclear weapons.' The newspaper pointed out in accordance with Washington's instructions this policy should be "tough enough" to compel them (the U.S. allies) to fulfill existing commitments with regard to their role in operations connected with nuclear weapons and their deployment." It also cited a statement by a "high-ranking representative" of the Reagan administration: "Unless we (that is the U.S. Administration--V.M.) succeed in controlling our allies on the question of ship visits and the deployment of nuclear weapons, they will gradually disperse...."

And so the crack of the whip can be heard. How else to assess the above-mentioned statements by "high ranking representatives" of the United States?

Some 4 months have elapsed since the publication of this NEW YORK TIMES report. The "system of measures" elaborated in the power centers across the ocean has undoubtedly been put into operation. What is its effect? Let us mention one highly characteristic and important thing--the recent meeting of NATO leading organs in Portugal. It showed that the U.S. allies, despite the strong pressure which is being brought to bear on them, are in no hurry to associate themselves to the U.S. program to create strike weapons in space. We will not guess what will emerge in the future. It is clear, however, that the decision of the court in Frankfurt-am-Maine that the deployment of the new U.S. missiles in the FRG is contrary to the country's Fundamental Law is an important fact.

The mass movement permeated by the resolve to prevent our continent from being turned into a heap of atomic ashes can rely on existing legal norms and provisions of international law and of the international legislation of a particular country. This legislation, of course, was not drafted and approved in the interests of the forces of the antiwar movement. But the initiators of the new, risky round of the nuclear arms race across the ocean are going so far in their threatening behavior that they are contradicting even the norms of existing bourgeois law in the West. That is why the court in Frankfurt-am-Maine is citing articles of the FRG Fundamental Law in its decision. And these references are impeccable from the legal and moral viewpoints.

CSO: 5200/1318

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

DEFINITIVE DUTCH DECISION ON INF VIEWED UNLIKELY

Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD in Dutch 13 Jun 85 p 7

[Article by Dr P.F. Maas, director of the Center for Parliamentary History at the Catholic University of Nijmegen: "Definitive Decision on Cruise Missiles Unlikely"]

[Text] Following months of fighting over details in a permanent atmosphere of crisis between the CDA [Christian Democratic Appeal] and the VVD [People's Party for Freedom and Democracy], the Lubbers administration surprised friends and foes on 1 June 1984 by suddenly making a decision, which was as original as it was senseless, about the possible stationing of cruise missiles in Woensdrecht. The administration postponed a final decision until 1 November 1985 and made it dependent on the number of SS-20's deployed in Russia.

During the debate in the Second Chamber, the administration coupled the decision on the cruise missiles together with Dutch nuclear tasks, and Lubbers promised to present both the draft treaty and the final treaty to the Chamber for approval.

Postponement or Abandonment

On 13 June 1984, Lubbers firmly told the Second Chamber: ... "that we feel it is important to choose an approach whereby the responsibility we are assuming now with this position will fall back on the same administrative team -- putting aside any intermediate crisis... Our own responsibility, not shifted to a subsequent administration..." Manly talk, aimed at reassuring the VVD and the NATO partners.

However, a sober look at the facts reveals that postponement or a cabinet crisis are more likely during this administrative period than a definitive decision. As a matter of fact, there will be municipal council elections in March 1986 followed by parliamentary elections in May. Prior to that the coalition partners would have to reach an agreement on the number of Dutch nuclear tasks, the problem of precisely determining the number of SS-20's which have been deployed would have to be solved, the treaty with the United States would have to be approved by parliament, possible Russian steps would have to be reacted to and the NATO partners would in any case have to be fully consulted and informed.

Meanwhile, the skirmishes between CDA and VVD about the number of nuclear tasks have increased. It is virtually certain that the VVD as well as Minister de Ruiter will stick to four nuclear tasks. There is a strong undercurrent within the CDA which wants to prevent the possible deployment of cruise missiles and is an advocate of ending all nuclear tasks except for the Lance missile. In this respect, this undercurrent can count on support from the PvdA [Labor Party], for which a single nuclear task is acceptable because of the power and negotiation position of the Netherlands within the NATO alliance. By way of compromise the CDA and the VVD may meet one another at three nuclear tasks, but such a compromise will take time if only because of the public platform and the election fever. Remember, without compromise there will be no decision on the cruise missiles.

Procedures

The administration has promised parliament that in the fall a debate can be held on the major lines of the treaty with the United States. Even though the Advisory Committee on questions pertaining to international law, which includes a choice selection of very learned experts, referred to the deployment decision "as a policy agreement which politically commits the participating governments, but does not legally bind the states" and thus did not consider parliamentary approval necessary, the Lubbers administration decided to lay down a possible deployment decision in the form of a treaty anyhow.

It felt that in "such a socially important matter" parliamentary supervision afterwards was not sufficient. An opinion which was supported by the Council of State. Consequently, the Netherlands will be spared the "Martens procedure" which synchronized the arrival of the cruise missiles with parliamentary debate on the Belgian administration's decision in favor of the actual stationing. I doubt that the treaty form is all that much more desirable, because the peculiar and especially emotional character of the problems involved is virtually certain to lead to unusual and politically determined texts and clauses.

In its innocence the administration originally thought it would develop the general lines of the treaty "from the provisions found in the agreement to store American army equipment in the Netherlands." It is to be expected that the debate on the general lines will concentrate on aspects of management, without however leading to politically binding conclusions because all parties, like the Council of State, first want to have a look at the actual text.

The administration itself promoted the confusion by producing no less than four options with ascending levels of Dutch control over the deployment of cruise missiles. This is a strongly academic question given that in case of emergency there will either be no time for comprehensive and thorough consultations, or adequate time only for the existing, extremely careful, but cumbersome and time consuming NATO procedures. Parliamentary decision making on the final text of the treaty will take place during the period of municipal and parliamentary elections. A hesitating CDA and a delaying PvdA would then have all the opportunity to slow down the parliamentary process.

Too much pressure from the cabinet and the government parties to quickly complete the decision making process has the effect on society of a provocation. The opposition and peace advocates would accuse the coalition of trying to bind the Netherlands, in the face of a likely electoral defeat, to a treaty which the majority of the people does not want and does not accept.

The political confusion will undoubtedly near a climax by 1 November if Gromyko takes the trouble to invite Van den Broek to Moscow for an exchange of ideas on the, in his eyes, warmongering and provocative intentions of the Lubbers administration.

In short, much water will have to flow over the dam for a cruise missile treaty to be signed with the United States before the elections. But if the impossible were to happen, then the treaty would definitely include a cancellation clause, different from the usual "with mutual consent," as included among other things in the agreement of 15 January 1981 on the establishment of storage locations and the maintenance of American army equipment in the Netherlands. Such a treaty will have a duration of at least 5 years, presumably 10 years.

It is conceivable that the VVD and the CDA, within a possible coalition with the PvdA, would agree to "consultations with the government of the United States about the question of whether in the light of the striving for arms control a reconsideration of the treaty makes sense, in this case whether it is possible." Such consultations would not produce any results in and of themselves, unless the United States is interested in them in terms of its own political goals. Neither the VVD nor the CDA can participate in any unilateral termination, in this case suspension of the implementation of the treaty.

For the sake of the continued existence of the then ruling coalition, the "renegotiations" could then be stretched out until the end of 1988, provided that the PvdA agrees with the continued construction of the base at Woensdrecht. This would be extremely hard for the PvdA rank and file to understand, unless the PvdA leaders work simultaneously at reducing the number of Dutch nuclear tasks and tirelessly state that they will not give their permission for the stationing of the cruise missiles, fervently hoping meanwhile for acceptable negotiation results in Geneva.

If such results do not materialize, then the only thing left is a possible government crisis about the intention of the PvdA majority in the cabinet to prevent the deployment of the cruise missiles by the end of 1988. However, a possible coalition partner would want to know beforehand precisely what is going to happen with our defense budget, the nuclear tasks, the treaty, the construction of the missile base, etcetera, so that a government formation with the PvdA in 1986 could take a very long time, all the more so as both the CDA and the VVD know that a very detailed government agreement is the only guarantee for a minority against the danger of always being outvoted in the cabinet.

For the time being I consider the claim that a coalition with the PvdA would or could annul the possible treaty with the United States to be electoral bluff, because a treaty with the United States is quite different from a

treaty with South Africa or Suriname, which could be rescinded or suspended as the case may be without encroachment on the international legal order.

"Pacta sunt servanda" or treaties must be implemented also applies to the PvdA.

8463

CSO: 5200/2668

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE

GRINEVSKIY PRESS CONFERENCE ON CSCE ANNIVERSARY

LD241219 Moscow TASS in English 1147 GMT 24 Jul 85

["Press Conference at the Soviet Foreign Ministry" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow July 24 TASS -- The Helsinki Final Act went down in history as a basic document which had absorbed the collective social and political systems, Vladimir Lomeyko, head of the Press Department of the Soviet Foreign Ministry, said at a press conference given here on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the signing of the Final Act of the European conference.

Summing up the results of the past decade, the Foreign Ministry spokesman said, we come to the conclusion that a good deal of what the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe achieved has stood its ground, survived and put down strong roots, substantially benefiting the peoples. The Soviet Union is a convinced advocate of the cause initiated by the European conference being carried on and promoted.

Answering questions from correspondents, Vladimir Lomeyko said that the forthcoming meeting of the foreign ministers of the countries participating in the European Conference in Helsinki to mark the 10th anniversary of the Final Act was fundamentally important, especially under conditions of international tension. Despite every attempt of the enemies of detente to derail that process and despite all the actions of the forces opposed to the principles of equality and equal security in world politics and bent on imposing the principles of policy "from strength," the participants in the meeting are displaying a dominant tendency to preserve everything achieved during the past 10 years, to safeguard the capital of European cooperation and find ways to resolve complex problems which are causing world tensions.

Ambassador-at-large Oleg Grinevskiy, the chief Soviet delegate to the Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe, said that the talks at the conference were making very slow progress. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries, the ambassador continued, stand for achieving positive and substantial results on the entire range of problems, both political and military. But some of our partners, in particular, the USA and its closest allies, obviously are in no hurry. Their position still lacks the constructive attitude which could enable the talks to enter a businesslike and vigorous phase.

It was also pointed out at the press conference that the Helsinki Final Act had given a fresh impetus to economic, trade and cultural contacts between the East and West. Socialist countries have been doing everything possible fully to translate the decisions of the European conference into practice. But the Western countries, primarily the USA, have during the past decade been resorting to all sorts of artificial obstacles, including embargoes and sanctions, to hold back the development of relations in those fields.

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE

SOVIET AMBASSADOR GRINEVSKIY EXAMINES LATEST SESSION

PM231055 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Jul 85 First Edition p 5

[O. Grinevskiy article: "Stockholm: What's New?"]

[Text] The latest session of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe, in which the 35 states which took part in the all-European conference in Helsinki in 1975 are taking part, ended in the Swedish capital at the beginning of this month. The conference is among those international forums which are intended to help restore detente to the European continent and break the dangerous vicious circle: confrontation -- arms race -- confrontation. In the troubling nuclear age we need political thinking which accords with the realities of the age. Such concepts as the policy of strength, deterrence, and the attainment of military superiority must give way to the nonuse of force, confidence, and mutual consideration of security interests. The attainment of these goals is the aim of the proposals put forward in Stockholm by the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact countries in both the political and the military sphere.

Pivot of Debate

It is no accident that M. Kerkiluoto, the Finnish representative at the conference, described the question of the nonuse of force, raised by the socialist countries, as the pivot of the debate. Its resolution would be an expression of the concentrated will of the European states, the United States, and Canada to set a course toward strengthening the foundations of peaceful cooperation between our countries.

It is pleasing to see -- and this can certainly be counted on the credit side at the conference -- that despite U.S. resistance, the socialist countries' proposal on the nonuse of military force has firmly entered into the fabric of the Stockholm talks. An animated and at times sharp debate started over the Soviet document on the basic provisions of such a treaty. And that is only natural, because the Soviet proposal develops, and gives concrete form to the general formulation of the principle of the nonuse of force in what is, at present, the most important salient -- that of banning the use of weapons of any kind, either nuclear or conventional. To put it in legal language, we want to prevent the use of material resources or the execution of actions contrary to the principle of the nonuse of force.

Naturally, it is not a question of copying out the UN Charter or the Helsinki Final Act all over again. On the contrary, while reaffirming the provisions they contain on banning the use of force or the threat of its use and taking them as a starting point,

the socialist countries, in line with the reality of the growth of the danger of war, propose to concentrate attention on making the nonuse of military force the effective norm of European -- and not only European -- life.

The more so since positive experience exists in this regard. Despite the fact that the principle of the nonuse of force already figures in the UN Charter, the 35 states which took part in the all-European conference in Helsinki considered it necessary and useful to state it once again, and in a more detailed form. So what is stopping us now from developing the principle of the nonuse of force still further, especially as regards those aspects of it which were not given concrete expression either in the UN Charter or in the Helsinki Final Act?

As the debate showed, the neutral and nonaligned states also advocate that an international commitment on the nonuse of force assume the necessary weight and authority and that its specific content serve to improve the present dangerous situation in Europe.

There is wide support among them for Cyprus' proposal that a solemn declaration on banning force in any of its manifestations be adopted in Stockholm.

Western Countries -- France, Italy, Spain, Greece, and others -- are in favor of making the principle of the nonuse of force effective. It is clear from their representatives' speeches that what they want is not simply to reaffirm this principle, but to develop it and express its content in the form of concrete confidence-building measures in the military sphere.

Of course, by no means all the NATO countries are yet prepared for businesslike talks. Despite a year of being forced to make promises, the United States has yet to give a sensible answer concerning its position on this very important international problem. Statements have been made at a very authoritative level in Washington to the effect that "the United States is prepared to discuss the Soviet proposal on the nonuse of force in the context of the Soviet Union's consent to concrete confidence-building measures." As is well known, the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries have made their own concrete proposals on military issues too. These are on the negotiating table. And? As before, no movement on the U.S. side. And it is clear from the U.S. representatives' statements that they are hoping to get away with the mere repetition of what is enshrined in the UN Charter concerning the nonuse of force. But how much good would come of such a repetition? We cannot but agree with Canada's representative, who said that if the aim is simply to repeat the principle, that would serve no purpose.

On Confidence

The working documents submitted by the socialist countries on limiting the scale of military exercises in Europe, on notification of large-scale exercises by ground, air, and naval forces, and also on large-scale troop movements and shipments provided a new direction for the development of the debate on military confidence-building measures.

It is no secret that the holding of large-scale maneuvers involving hundreds of thousands of servicemen, thousands of tanks, and hundreds of combat aircraft and ships equipped with modern, lethal weapons can cause an increase in tension and constitute a threat to the European peoples' security. The more so since at times exercises in Europe take on such a large scale that they can hardly be distinguished from the deployment of troops for the commencement of hostilities, as can be seen from the example of certain NATO maneuvers.

The regions of NATO naval exercises are also coming closer and closer to Europe. But more than once there have been cases where, literally before the whole world's eyes, ordinary U.S. exercises have seemingly been transformed into aggressive acts against sovereign states. And large-scale troop shipments? Are not they one of the signs of preparations for the start of war? They have not infrequently been used and, unfortunately, are used today as a means of exerting forceful pressure, blackmail, and intimidation and constitute a major source of suspicion and distrust in interstate relations.

The measures proposed by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are aimed precisely at lessening suspicion and tension, and thus strengthening confidence and security. In terms of both their scale and their nature these measures go considerably further than the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act. They deal not only with large-scale ground forces exercises, but also with large-scale air force and naval exercises, troop movements, and troop shipments. All this constitutes a real leap forward both from the viewpoint of the nature of the military activity subject to notification and the exchange of information on such activity, and from the viewpoint of the fulfillment of confidence-building measures.

The socialist countries' proposals correspond to the positions of the neutral and non-aligned states in many respects. The majority of these states energetically advocate the limitation of the scale of military exercises. Sweden, Finland, Yugoslavia, Malta, Cyprus and others also supported, in the main, our approach to the question of extending confidence-building measures to the activity of such strike forces as air and naval forces.

In comparison with the socialist countries' proposals, which really lead toward a lowering of the level of military confrontation in Europe, the U.S. and NATO position largely amounts to only a few not very significant shifts in the parameters of notification of ground forces exercises provided for in the Final Act. Frankly, all this looks odd. The Western countries call on the Soviet Union to adopt cardinal confidence-building measures, but themselves propose at best a modest improvement in the Helsinki measures adopted 10 years ago.

In general, it must be said that the U.S. and NATO proposals are mainly oriented not so much toward strengthening confidence as toward obtaining information which has nothing to do with confidence, but rather the reverse -- it arouses suspicion regarding the intentions of those who try to obtain that information. By any classification, this information is intelligence. For instance, it is a question of the European states' giving information about the structure and location of units and formations and their mobilization activity. Yet it is not envisaged that the United States would provide the same information. For instance, no information would be provided on the U.S. dual-based forces, which are specially earmarked for shipment to Europe and which form the basis of NATO's military might as regards ground forces. Air and naval forces, the main U.S. and NATO strike forces intended for operations in Europe, would remain outside this "exchange of information."

It appears that the NATO politicians regard confidence-building measures as a kind of pump for getting information out of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries concerning the most important parameters of their military potential. It goes without saying that serious talks cannot be built on this basis.

Deeds Are Needed

The U.S. delegation solemnly declared that its objective at the Stockholm conference is to seek a reduction in the possibility of any war at all. Of course, it would be

possible to agree entirely with this objective. But one would like to know: In what way does the United States intend to reduce the possibility of any war at all by excluding large-scale air force and naval exercises from the system of notification and observation? Is it really necessary to remind people that for the United States, World War II started with the surprise attack on Pearl Harbor -- by air and naval forces?

Former French President Poincare once observed wittily that the trouble with some people is that they are preparing not for the next war, but for the last. The U.S. proposals seem to be aimed at preventing not even the last war, but the one before last.

Diplomatic talks -- provided, of course, that people seek their success and do not try to turn them into a monotonous exchange of threadbare arguments -- are a dynamic process requiring the development of the sides' positions, a bold quest, proposals and counterproposals aimed at the attainment of mutually acceptable agreements. Talks can only be constructive if all the participants make movements toward each other, and do not try to impose their own views and concepts on each other.

The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries seek to conduct talks in a positive spirit.

The proposals submitted by them take account of the considerations and desires expressed by the neutral and nonaligned countries as well as the NATO states. But no movement on the part of NATO to meet them halfway could be perceived at the conference. The position of the United States and some of its allies has become ossified, so to speak, and there was not even any attempt on their part to take account of the views of the other participants in the talks. All this prevents the conference from moving toward practical talks and does not allow it to establish a businesslike pace.

The Stockholm conference has been in progress for 18 months now. That is quite a long time. Especially since little more than a year remains for a report to be submitted on the work done to the Vienna meeting of participants in the all-European process, which is to evaluate it and adopt a decision on the transition to the second stage of the conference -- the discussion of disarmament measures too.

There is no denying that in that time, especially after the creation of working parties, it has been possible to examine many questions in varying degrees of depth. Not only the sides' positions and the paths forward, but also the difficulties hampering progress can now be seen more clearly. As the debate has shown, the conference has the potential for progress and could achieve mutually acceptable accords. To this end, it is necessary for the United States to take a constructive stand and embark on concrete, equal talks in Stockholm, as the socialist and nonaligned countries propose.

CSO: 5200/1320

9 August 1985

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

USSR: REPORTS ON PROCEEDINGS OF SUMMER 1985 SESSION

Major Issues Surveyed

PM041810 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 26, Jun 85 p 9

[V. Baburov article: "On the Agenda Priority Items"]

[Text] The summer session of the world disarmament conference, which opened in Geneva on 11 June, is to discuss prevention of the arms race in outer space and banning chemical and other weapons of mass destruction.

The conference, in which 40 countries from all five continents are taking part, resumed its deliberations in a complicated situation. On the one hand, through the fault of the U.S. and its close allies, the arms race is continuing and the danger of it spilling over to outer space is increasing. On the other hand, under the influence of the peaceful policy of the socialist and non-aligned countries, the peace movement and sober-minded statesmen in the West, the United States has agreed to talks with the Soviet Union on a package of nuclear and space arms issues. A new round of these talks began in Geneva on 30 May.

High on the agenda of the summer session is the question of preventing an arms race in outer space. After long consultations between the representatives of all the regional groups, the spring session of the conference decided to set up an ad hoc committee which was initially charged with carefully examining the issues relating to the prevention of an arms race in space.

The task of the committee is, however, complicated by the circumstances in which it will have to start its work: Washington is going ahead with its policy of developing space strike weapons and trying to draw its allies into the "Star Wars" programme. This policy was excoriated by most participants in the previous session of the conference and did not meet with unanimous support even among U.S. partners in NATO. The French delegation, for instance, expressed fears that if the "Star Wars" project went ahead, it might undermine strategic stability.

Much has also to be done at the conference to prevent nuclear war and achieve nuclear disarmament. Until recently the West turned a deaf ear to the socialist and nonaligned nations' calls to work out concrete measures in this direction. To justify its unconstructive stance the West declared that some

aspects of nuclear armaments were being considered at the Soviet-American talks.

The task of setting up an ad hoc committee on preventing nuclear war therefore remains topical. At the spring session of the conference the United States and its allies refused to form such a body, on the pretext that this question had not been studied thoroughly enough. Characteristic of the position of Western countries, especially the Federal Republic of Germany, is the striving to talk about preventing war in general. In this way they would like to obscure the threat of nuclear war. At the same time, realizing that in the face of the growing nuclear threat this burning problem cannot be ignored completely, they admit the possibility of discussing it in one or another way. However, the manoeuvring of this question by the United States and other NATO countries is rightly arousing discontent at the conference.

The majority of conference participants do not approve either of the Western countries' unyielding stand on the question of setting up an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament. The West's arguments against talks on this question have been destroyed by socialist and developing states who have proposed working out a programme for phased nuclear disarmament.

The obstructionist stand the U.S. and other Western countries have taken on the question of the complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapon tests also gives rise to discontent at the conference. The socialist states and Asian, African and Latin American countries have roundly condemned their persistent attempts to divert the conference from businesslike talks on this burning problem and to make it discuss only certain aspects of it, mainly verification.

The socialist and non-aligned countries stress, with good reason, that the existing means are sufficient for verification of the observance of a future treaty banning all nuclear weapons tests. In their opinion, progress on this question would favourably influence the work of a third conference to be held in autumn to review the observance of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

The current session of the disarmament conference is expected to carry further the question of banning other types of mass destruction weapons. This concerns above all the drafting of a convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons. But the talks on this question are hindered by Washington's unconstructive stand, its insistence on unjustifiably tough measures of supervision, especially in regard to the socialist countries, as a condition for the conclusion of a future convention. Washington's position is not backed on many points by its partners, who show greater realism in their approach to this question. The talks are clearly being hampered by the desire on the part of certain U.S. quarters to update the U.S. chemical arsenals, to develop new types of chemical weapons.

The prohibition of radiological weapons is another burning issue on the agenda of the disarmament conference. An ad hoc committee will have to do substantial work to draw the different views on this question closer together so as to provide the necessary conditions for the prohibition of a new type of mass destruction weapon.

The Soviet Union's stand on the questions being discussed at the session is characterized by its firm conviction that all nations, both big and small, should contribute to the search for realistic solutions that can check and reverse the dangerous tendencies and can lessen world tension. It is actively working to curb the arms race, above all the nuclear arms race, and to prevent it from spreading to outer space.

Soviet, Bloc Envoys Hit SDI

LD191933 Moscow TASS in English 1915 GMT 11 Jul 85

[Text] Geneva July 11 TASS -- TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Korzhev reports:

The Soviet Union, just as the overwhelming majority of states, declares against the militarization of space and holds that the implementation of the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI) of the United States will have most disastrous consequences for entire mankind, also for the United States itself, said head of the delegation Viktor Israelyan. Addressing today a plenary meeting of the Geneva disarmament conference he noted that the SDI is the only programme in whose framework the intention has been proclaimed and intensive efforts are made to deploy in space a new class of weapons, strike space arms, weapons of global actions with qualitatively new tasks and characteristics. The Soviet Union has no such programmes and no such intention.

The Soviet representative stressed that the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev in answer to the address of the U.S. public organization "Union of Concerned Scientists" made definite assurance that the Soviet Union will not be the first to make a step into space with arms.

The working document on "the prevention of the arms race in space" tabled by a group of socialist countries -- participants in the Geneva Conference, pursues the aim of arresting dangerous developments by adopting effective and urgent measures as a result of talks both bilateral and multilateral at a time when there is a real threat of the arms race being spread to space. The authors of the document, specifically, suggest to agree on a ban and liquidation of a whole class of strike space arms, including anti-satellite systems and space-based anti-missile systems.

Submitting that document, L. Bayart, representative of the Mongolian People's Republic, stressed that it expressed sincere striving of socialist countries to bar the spread of the arms race to space and to use space only in peaceful purposes to the benefit of entire mankind.

The United States, quite on the contrary, wishes to turn space into a new arena of confrontation, Czechoslovakias representative Milos Vejvoda said in his speech. The SDI programme is aimed at disrupting the military-strategic balance and at achieving the military superiority over the USSR. It has already affected adversely the overall political climate, the East-West relations and the course of the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva.

The Soviet Union's stand is a patent example of a different approach to space programmes. M. Vejvoda said. Two years ago the USSR imposed a moratorium on putting anti-satellite weapons into space and declared that it will be operating as long as other states act likewise. This creates favourable conditions for achieving agreement on putting an end to the work to create new anti-satellite systems and on liquidating those weapons systems that the USSR and the USA already have, including those whose tests have not yet been completed.

IZVESTIYA Report

PM151344 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Jul 85 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent V. Kuznetsov report: "Preventing Weapons in Space"]

[Text] Geneva -- The reply of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the U.S. Union of Concerned Scientists has been disseminated as an official document of the disarmament conference.

At the recent plenary sessions representatives of the socialist and developing states, commenting on M.S. Gorbachev's statement, have stressed that the Soviet Union's pledge not to be the first to deploy weapons in space and the appeal to the United States "not to take such a fatal step" is a concretization of the policy of the nonmilitarization of space.

In their speeches the Czechoslovak and Mongolian delegations stressed that the implementation of the Washington "star wars" programs will have the most catastrophic consequences for mankind. The launching into space of nuclear systems and the deployment on earth of armaments to destroy space installations will mean a qualitative new stage in the arms race and the militarization of space, which is opposed by 150 states within the UN framework.

"Averting an arms race in space," Soviet delegation head V.L. Israelyan said, "is now the central issue of contemporary international relations. The idea of 'star wars,' directed toward creating and deploying nuclear space systems, lies in guaranteeing the possibility of an unpunished nuclear strike, that is, achieving military superiority. The assertion that President Reagan's 'Strategic Defense Initiative' is ultimately aimed at curtailing the nuclear arms race is false since it accelerates the development of defensive and offensive arms and is capable of ensuring neither security nor disarmament since these are political problems which can and must be resolved in conditions of strengthening trust between states.

"Those who are counting on using the plans for the militarization of space as a means of pressuring the Soviet Union" V.L. Israelyan said, "are deluding themselves profoundly. These plans shatter the existing treaty system for limiting the arms race in space and on earth.

"Strategic stability and trust," V.L. Israelyan points out, "would undoubtedly be strengthened if the United States agreed with the USSR in a substantive manner its commitment to the treaty on limiting antimissile defense systems. The USSR strictly fulfilling its obligations, calls on the United States to reject the plans it is hatching for the militarization of space, which will inevitably lead to the breaking of a key link in the process of nuclear arms limitation.

"The Soviet Union," the USSR delegation head said in conclusion, "proceeds from the fact that space should serve peace and that the practical resolution of this task is possible if all the participants in the talks have the political will and a sincere desire to achieve this historic goal."

Moscow Commentary on SDI

LD111902 Moscow World Service in English 1310 GMT 11 Jul 85

[Text] At the current regular session of the Disarmament Conference in Geneva the socialist countries have come out with a new initiative. Aleksandr Pogodin makes these comments:

We'd like to remind you that the agenda of the conference sessions, attended by delegates from 40 countries, is drawn up on the basis of the recommendations of the United Nations General Assembly. At the end of last year the United Nations session urged the Geneva conference to take steps to hold talks for working out an agreement on the prevention of an arms race in space in all its aspects. Acting in accordance with the recommendations, the socialist countries have submitted to the conference a working document that points to the need of banning all strike space systems, antimissile systems based in space, and antisatellite systems and proposes an appropriate treaty. The importance and timeliness of the initiative does not arouse any doubts. The "star wars" program worked out by the Washington Administration has increased the threat of militarization of outer space many times over. Its implementation would inevitably increase the threat of nuclear war and give an impetus to the uncontrolled arms race in all directions. This would also undermine the Soviet-American antiballistic missile defense agreement, signed for an indefinite period of time -- a document which has been called in the world a key to the entire process of limiting nuclear armaments.

The world is also widely expressing the opinion that the "star wars" plans have the most harmful effect on the course of Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space armaments. There are many signs showing that the American side is trying to use the talks as a screen for implementing its program of militarization of outer space. The Soviet Union has stressed at the highest level that it would never agree to this. It simply cannot permit the talks to be used for diverting attention, for camouflaging military preparations -- preparations the purpose of which is to guarantee the United States strategic superiority and the possibility of an unpunished nuclear strike.

The necessity for constructive results at the Geneva talks, to which humanity attaches so many hopes, is absolutely clear. However, so far the American program for militarizing space has played the role of a wall blocking the road to agreements. The new proposal of the socialist countries at the disarmament conference opens up real ways to the prevention of the spreading of the arms race to outer space and its transformation into an arena of military rivalry.

Israelyan Hits U.S. Congress on CBW

LD191716 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 19 Jul 85

[Text] Speaking of the disarmament conference in Geneva, the head of the USSR delegation, Izraelyan, condemned the recent decision by the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives to allocate funds for the production of a new type of chemical weapons -- nerve-paralyzing binary weapons. At the request of the Soviet delegation, the TASS statement of 10 July this year, which stresses that the U.S. Government bears full responsibility for all the consequences of this step, was distributed as a working document of the conference. It is the direct duty of the peoples not to permit the new crime being prepared against peace and mankind.

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

SOVIET ENVOY ADDRESSES SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON SPACE ARMS

OW261219 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1045 GMT 25 Jun 85

[From the "World Today" Program presented by Vsevolod Shishkovskiy]

[Text] The first session of a new subsidiary organ of the Geneva Disarmament Conference, the special committee on the question of preventing an arms race in outer space, has been held in Geneva.

Stressing the primary significance of this problem, Israelyan, head of the Soviet delegation, stated that the study and use of space must only be carried out for peaceful purposes, and that this is a fully attainable goal. He said: One should not invent new types of armaments, but conduct honest and business-like talks on working out effective agreements for preventing an arms race in space and halting it on earth.

The participants in the session of the UN Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space being held in New York also state this. They express serious concern over the testing of components of an antimissile defense system with space-based elements that have begun in the United States.

As is known, such a test was carried out during the last flight of the U.S. spacecraft Discovery. In these conditions--and this is resolutely stated by the participants in the New York forum--the initiatives of the Soviet Union and efforts of other socialist and peace-loving nonaligned states directed at keeping space free from weapons acquire even greater importance.

CSO: 5200/1321

MUTUAL AND BALANCED FORCE REDUCTIONS

USSR BLAMES NATO FOR LACK OF PROGRESS IN 36TH ROUND

Soviet Chief Delegate Comments

LD111632 Moscow TASS in English 1611 GMT 11 Jul 85

[Text] Vienna July 11 TASS -- The results of the completed 36th round of the talks on the Mutual Reduction of Armed Forces and Armaments in Central Europe cannot be described as either satisfactory or encouraging, the head of the delegation of the U.S.S.R., Valerian Mikhaylov, said at a plenary meeting here. A realistic possibility for making progress at the talks offered by the proposal of the socialist countries of February 14, 1985 on an initial reduction of ground troops and armaments in Central Europe by the Soviet Union and the United States and subsequent non-increase of the levels of armed forces and armaments of the sides in that region was missed. The draft provisions of such an agreement have everything needed for reaching a mutually acceptable accord. However, so far there has been no reply from the NATO countries on the substance of that proposal.

Throughout the latest round of the talks, the Soviet representative went on to say, Western participants never went beyond general reiteration of their previous, biased and unrealistic positions which largely contradict the subject and essence of the Vienna talks. It is becoming ever more obvious that the U.S. and its NATO allies do not want to undertake anything materially tangible along the lines of mutual reduction of the levels of military confrontation. This can be seen, above all, from their reluctance under different kinds of pretext to spread reductions and limitations on armaments or to agree to any steps for effectively lowering confrontation. Herein lies the source of the difficulties encountered by the talks.

The obstructionist position of Western participants, their reluctance to seek mutually acceptable accords in Vienna are in essence the extension and reflection of the West's military and political concepts existing at present. One cannot fail to see that the long-term decisions and practical actions taken by NATO, especially in recent period, to strengthen and modernize its armed forces and armaments are aimed not at containing and limiting the growth of the armed forces and armaments but at [words indistinct] at attaining superiority over the Warsaw Treaty states.

Dwelling on the issue of verification, the Soviet representative stressed that in view of the absence to date of the agreed and clear-cut notion of the sides of what the main, material part of the planned agreement will look like and what precisely should be verified there is no point in starting any debates on verification. The socialist countries are firm in the opinion that in every concrete case the format of verification should be adequate to the volume and character of steps along the lines of genuine lowering of the levels of military confrontation and along the lines of disarmament. Verification is that field where realism and the sense of reasonable measure are particularly needed. There can be no other approach to that matter.

It was pointed out once again that the Warsaw Treaty member-states are unwaveringly striving for a substantial and effective accord which would not mislead the people but in fact lead toward mutual reduction of confrontation of the armed forces and armaments in Central Europe and would have a positive impact on the European situation. The best that could be done in the conditions existing at the talks at present is to reach agreement on those aspects which lend themselves to mutually acceptable solution already now.

The head of the Soviet delegation expressed the hope that as a result of the examination of the February proposal of the socialist countries in the NATO capitals the Western side would come up with a genuinely constructive reply to it which would make it possible at last to reach the first tangible accord in Vienna.

The head of the U.S. delegation Robert Blackwill spoke at the plenary meeting on behalf of the NATO countries. His speech boiled down to reiteration of the previous, unconstructive positions. It contained no indication of the desire and readiness of the Western side to seek mutually acceptable decisions in the context of the February proposal of the socialist countries.

The beginning of the next round of the talks is scheduled for September 26.

West 'Marking Time'

LD160040 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1915 GMT 15 Jul 85

[From the "World Today" program presented by Eduard Mnatsakanov]

[Text] As you know, the latest round of the talks on mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe, the 36th, has ended recently in the Hofburg Palace in Vienna. These are both very important and very difficult talks. They are important because their participants -- delegations from the Warsaw pact countries and NATO -- are supposed to elaborate specific measures for the reduction of the level of military confrontation in Central Europe, which means for reducing tension and strengthening mutual trust, peace and security on the continent. They are difficult because, as practice shows, the representatives of NATO, headed by the United States, are not playing fairly in Vienna, but are playing a hopeless game, trying to outwit the other side in any way they can and secure for themselves unilateral military advantages at the expense of the security interests of the socialist states. In this lies the fundamental reason for the fact that the talks have been marking time without any kind of apparent progress at them for about 13 years.

It is difficult now even just to enumerate all the proposals that Soviet Union and its allies have made in Vienna through those years. In February of this year the socialist countries made a new, important and constructive initiative. They proposed that an agreement be reached immediately -- more precisely in the course of a year -- on reducing the ground forces stationed in Central Europe: of the USSR by 20,000 and of the U.S. by 13,000 people. Once these reductions are complete the countries in the Warsaw Pact and the North Atlantic bloc would be obliged not to increase -- in other words, to freeze -- the level of their armed forces and armaments in this region.

The idea of this proposal is primarily to take just a first step, albeit a partial, but constructive step towards reduction, and finally to get the talks out of deadlock. We

rightly expected that these compromise proposals, which were initially approved even by the U.S. State Department, would be accepted by the West. Even in February Washington officially announced that the Soviet proposals would be carefully studied. But now 6 months have already passed, and the studying is still continuing. The results of the last round of talks, as Comrade Mikhaylov, the leader of the USSR delegation said, could be called neither satisfactory nor encouraging.

It seems as if history is repeating itself. The West is continuing to obstruct the talks, and this is understandable. He who is pushing ahead the arms race, developing plans for the strengthening, improving and modernizing of nuclear and conventional armaments and NATO armed forces right up to the year 2000 can hardly be interested in the success of the Vienna talks. But the talks in the Austrian capital will continue. One must always fight for peace and disarmament, however difficult and at times exhausting this struggle might be. Of course, the Soviet Union and its allies will never concede their security. Never will anyone succeed in putting us in an unfavorable situation that infringes our rights. Such attempts are simply unrealistic. This means that in Vienna, just as at other talks on the limitation and reduction of weapons, a path to those agreements which serve equally the interests of the security of all must be sought -- it is precisely this that we seek.

CSO: 5200/1317

MUTUAL AND BALANCED FORCE REDUCTIONS

CSSR DELEGATION HEAD ON WEST'S LACK OF 'POLITICAL RESOLVE'

LD122049 Prague Domestic Service in Czech and Slovak 1630 GMT 12 Jul 85

[Commentary by Ludek Handl, head of the Czechoslovak delegation to the MBFR talks]

[Text] The 36th round of talks on mutual reduction of armed forces and arms in Central Europe concluded in Vienna yesterday. We have asked the head of the Czechoslovak delegation at these talks, Ambassador Ludek Handl, for his assessment:

[Begin Handl recording] In order to assess the course of this round of talks between the Warsaw Pact member countries and NATO, it is appropriate to recall that it was the socialist countries who, already 5 months ago, on 14 February, placed on the negotiating table a draft of basic provisions of an agreement on an initial reduction of Soviet and American ground forces and arms in Central Europe and, subsequently, not to raise the level of the armed forces and arms by the sides in this area.

We put forward the draft of a very simple, practical, but realistic agreement, which would enable the achievement of the first concrete results in a very short period should the West, naturally, display the political resolve and will to take such a step. The fact is that this draft has been based upon the very issues where the biggest understanding between the sides has already been achieved, and simultaneously we have temporarily set aside certain contentious or open questions in the interest of implementing it. The fact is that both sides have agreed that it should be the USSR and United States which should begin reducing the excessive concentration of troops and arms in Central Europe, and that this first step should be followed by a period of freezing the level of troops of all states that have ground forces in this area.

I regretablely must state that NATO states did not take a stand on our initiative both during the period following the submission of our proposal and in the course of the entire round. Thus, the course of action chosen by the Western delegations was above all marked by further delays and time-wasting and literally by fleeing from the substance of the problem under discussion by abstract theorising on disarmament agreements as such; to sum it up, by the employment of unconstructive tactics.

The Western participants at the talks also attempted during the current talks, as in the past, to divert the entire debate onto the questions of control and verification, although they were unable to give an answer on the fundamental question; specifically, what is to be supervised, what type of reduction will be involved, and to what extent and the like. Throughout the entire round the NATO delegations equally refused to unequivocally seek a mutually acceptable solution to the arms reduction question. Both in relation to control and the appropriate measures and in relation to the arms issue we, therefore, conveyed our unequivocal stand to the Western participants. We neither deny nor minimize the importance of control and verification measures: rather, we regard them as an important part of future agreements provided they are, of course, commensurate to the true reduction of the armed forces and arms. We, however, reject excessive emphasis on their role and importance and are against misusing this issue as some type of a pretext to conceal the West's unreadiness to discuss the substance of the matter, which is and remains a real reduction of the level of military confrontation in Central Europe.

Similarly, we unequivocally stressed with regard to the arms issue that it is not possible to achieve a true reduction in the level of military confrontation if arms, that is, the material means of this confrontation, remain untouched. We believe that neither ours' nor the West's public can accept such an agreement which will merely concern a withdrawal and reduction of troops but will leave immense stocks of the most modern arms and munition intact in Central Europe.

At the close of the round of talks we emphatically called upon our Western partners at the negotiating table not to indulge in any further delays and time-wasting and to take the opportunity of the talk's recess prior to the 37th round in September to come up with a constructive reply to our 14 February proposal. [End recording]

CSO: 5200/3066

MUTUAL AND BALANCED FORCE REDUCTIONS

CSSR: WEST FAILED TO USE 'GREAT OPPORTUNITY' IN 36TH ROUND

AU121312 Bratislava ROLNICKE NOVINY in Slovak 11 Jul 85 p 7

["S"-signed article: "The West Again Has Not Made Use of the Opportunities Offered by the Vienna Negotiations; Employing Tactical Maneuvers and Marking Time"]

[Text] In the Vienna Hofburg today ends this year's second round--the 36th since the talks began--of the negotiations conducted between 7 Warsaw Pact states and 12 NATO states on the reduction of armaments and the number of armed forces in Central Europe, that is, in a region in which the borders of the two military groupings touch, and where the risk of confrontation is greatest. Once again, tangible results were not achieved at this forum, which is already being called "the most protracted negotiations in the history of contemporary diplomacy." The reason is the tactics of NATO to which the West resorts regardless of the fact that there really exists the possibility of taking the first practical step toward fulfilling the mandate of that conference, which has been going on for more than 11 years now. On the negotiating table lay a significant initiative proposal of the socialist countries--the draft of the basic stipulations of an agreement on the initial reduction of ground troops and armament by the USSR and the United States in Central Europe, and subsequently not increasing the numbers of armed forces and armaments in that region.

The socialist countries who submitted this proposal--the CSSR, GDR, Polish People's Republic, and USSR--proceeded from the fact that on the aforementioned issues the standpoints of the two sides have converged most, and therefore it would be possible to conclude the first partial [ciastkova] agreement. In this respect the socialist countries met the West halfway on the issue of verification measures, and also in the feature that the agreement would have a mandatory character from the viewpoint of international law. The proposed agreement should be the first step toward achieving a comprehensive solution, with an equal number of NATO and Warsaw Pact armed forces remaining the final objective. The two sides should each have 900,000 men under arms, of which 700,000 men would be ground forces. We proceed from the two sides' identical standpoint that the process of reducing and limiting armed forces in

Central Europe should be started by the Soviet Union and the United States. We specifically propose that in the Central European region the strength of the Soviet troops be reduced by 20,000 men and the U.S. troops by 11,000 men--together with their equipment and combat technology. These troops should be relocated to their own territories and deployed in such a way as not to threaten the security of any of the states taking part in the Vienna negotiations.

The Western participants in the negotiations again have not made use of the great opportunity offered by the socialist countries in the latest round of negotiations in Geneva. At the negotiations they addressed themselves to all possible things except this proposal. They were marking time and indulging in tactics, obviously in order to gain time for realizing armament programs and attaining military superiority in accordance with U.S. wishes. Thus the adoption of a modest but nevertheless concrete limitation on troops and armaments in Central Europe is still not on the horizon.

CSO: 5200/3066

MUTUAL AND BALANCED FORCE REDUCTIONS

BRIEFS

CZECHOSLOVAK DELEGATE ON TALKS--Vienna, 11 Jul (CTK)--"The NATO states have been unable to take a stand even after 5 months on our proposal of 14 February," head of the Czechoslovak delegation Ludek Handl told CTK today at the end of the 36th round of the talks on the reduction of armed forces and armament in Central Europe. Characteristic of the West during this round was gaining time, evasion of the essence of the problems under discussion, and theorizing about some sort of generally valid criteria of disarmament talks. In addition to this tactic of obstruction, the West made it clear that it is not willing to seek a mutually acceptable solution of the question of armament reduction. Totally different was the approach of the Warsaw Treaty states. "We drew attention to the constructive, practical and realistic character of our proposal, explained its advantages in detail, and voiced our readiness to seek jointly a suitable compromise solution. We asked the NATO officials to stop wasting valuable time and provide a flexible and constructive reply to our initiative, aimed at real reduction of the level of military confrontation in Central Europe, at the 37th round in September," Ludek Handl said. [Text] [Prague CTK in English 1636 GMT 11 Jul 85]

CSO: 5200/3066

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

PRAVDA SEES U.S. BLOCKING AGREEMENT AT GENEVA ON BAN

PM231431 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Jul 85 First Edition p 4

[Article by B. Azanov: "A Ban on Chemical Weapons"]

[Text] The elaboration of a convention on banning chemical weapons occupies an important place among the questions under examination at the summer session of the Geneva conference on disarmament. Talks on a convention have been going on now for many years. The UN General Assembly has called for their acceleration on several occasions. What state are they in at the moment?

Why the Talks are at a Standstill

The delegations in Geneva have discussed in detail the broadest spectrum of questions pertaining to the subject of the talks. The general outline of the future convention is emerging. Its purpose is to ban the development, production, and stockpiling of chemical weapons and the use or transfer of them to anyone. At the same time, the convention will make it incumbent on states to eliminate stocks of these weapons and facilities for their production by a certain date.

The fulfillment of the convention will take place under national and international control, including on-site checks and the setting up of a consultative committee.

The Soviet Union is doing everything possible to ensure successful talks. On several occasions it has met other states halfway, both on the questions pertaining to the extent of the ban and on monitoring. Yet the talks have effectively been at a standstill, particularly in the past year.

As in other spheres of arms limitation, the United States is performing a blocking role. Official U.S. statements, including statements made at the highest level, abound in fine words about U.S. dedication to the aim of concluding a convention on banning chemical weapons as soon as possible. But Washington's practical steps do not accord with these fine-sounding declarations.

The talks have now reached the stage where all participants need to conduct a meticulous search for ways of surmounting the differences that have emerged. But the United States is acting in quite a different direction. When it submitted its draft convention in April 1984 -- and it remains the basis of its stance -- the United States introduced another bone of contention in Geneva. Its draft set the talks back and merely led to a deepening of contradictions, especially on questions of monitoring.

9 August 1985

Here is an example. At the bilateral Soviet-American talks which were held in 1976-1980 (they were unilaterally broken off by Washington), and then at the conference on disarmament an understanding was reached in principle that in the event of any doubts about observance of the convention, verification "on request" could be carried out on the territory of the "suspect" state. And as a guarantee against invalid requests the relevant state would have the right to forbid the verification, but not without proper explanation. But in its draft convention, the United States put forward the internationally unrealistic demand for compulsory inspections in any state and at any time, even if there are no grounds for suspicion (the so-called "standing invitation to inspection"). This would essentially nullify the agreed principle of verification, "on request."

The "standing invitation" concept envisages total monitoring, not in conditions of general and complete disarmament. It visibly contradicts the generally acknowledged principle of congruity of monitoring and disarmament measures, as laid down in the final document of the UN General Assembly first special session on disarmament (1978). Clearly, the forms and methods of monitoring proposed by the United States will result in disclosure of the military and commercial secrets of participating states which have no connection with questions of production, stockpiling, and storage of chemical weapons, and in disruption of various sectors of industry.

On the other hand, the United States is obviously intending, even when the convention is in force, to maintain an industrial base for the production of chemical weapons, primarily the latest types. It does not accept the Soviet proposal that all production of extremely dangerous ultratoxic, lethal chemicals for authorized purposes should be confined in each state to a single small, specialized facility which would be subject to regular inspection. The United States is fighting for the opportunity to produce such chemicals wherever and in whatever quantities it wishes. It also rejects the USSR's proposal for the total abandonment of the commercial industry production of the chemical compounds which form the basis of the latest nerve gases, in particular binary weapons. But the limitations proposed by the USSR would considerably facilitate monitoring as well as reinforcing the practice of not producing chemical weapons in commercial industry.

Finally, the all-embracing nature of chemical weapons prohibition is not sustained in the U.S. stance: the use of herbicides for military purposes and the use of irritants in armed and other conflicts are placed outside the confines of the convention.

This line contradicts the 1925 Geneva protocol prohibiting the use of asphyxiants, toxic, or other similar agents, and bacteriological means in warfare and is aimed at legitimizing the use of the toxic chemicals to which the United States resorted extensively during the disgraceful war against the peoples of Indochina.

Obviously, the U.S. position did not meet with approval among the talks participants, including some U.S. allies who are justifiably apprehensive about the fate both of their chemical industries and of the talks on banning chemical weapons. But whenever one of their representatives tries to seek real compromise he is invariably silenced by the U.S. envoys.

Washington's New Tricks

Very recently the United States has embarked on a number of tactical maneuvers to create the illusion of a "constructive" U.S. stance at the talks. For example, one recent proposal envisages the following phony compromise: in view of the U.S. ruler-

tance, it should continue producing its own ultratoxic, lethal chemicals without limits, while the Soviet Union and the other countries advocating limits on production for everyone should introduce them just for themselves. It is called "freedom of choice," but it is in fact a brazen bid to obtain one-sided advantages, and the only possible reason for making it is to obstruct the path to an accord.

To all appearances, Washington's strategy and tactics at the talks are in fact providing the propaganda cover for a U.S. chemical rearmament program whose centerpiece is to be the production of new, so-called binary, chemical munitions. The overall number of chemical munitions in U.S. arsenals is to rise sharply as a result of the implementation of the program from 3 million to 5 million units (some people regard even this figure as too low). Evidently U.S. diplomacy has been presented with the task of deadlocking the talks and trying to blame the Soviet Union for it. An old trick.

The other propaganda methods of safeguarding the binary program are not exactly original either. The chief one is the totally played-out "Soviet threat" myth. U.S. figures are spouting slander about an imaginary intention on the part of the USSR to start a chemical war in West Europe. In this connection they "discover" that U.S. stockpiles in the United States and West Europe are "hopelessly obsolete" and can no longer serve as a deterrent. At the same time, it is claimed that the United States' lack of adequate means of chemical "containment" increases the threat of nuclear war, since it may compel Washington to be the first to use nuclear weapons in the initial stages of the conflict. And the production of binary armaments is bound, they say, to have a beneficial effect on the talks and push the USSR toward an accord. In other words, in order to eliminate chemical weapons you have to have more and newer chemical weapons. What crazy logic!

U.S. spokesmen usually extol binary weapons as "safe" weapons which allegedly can be comfortably stored on U.S. territory. Such statements are meant primarily for the West Europeans, many of whom are seriously concerned about the fact that their countries are increasingly becoming repositories for American-made toxic chemical agents which imperil people's lives and health even in peacetime. But it follows from statements by senior U.S. military men, including the Supreme Allied Commander in Europe General B. Rogers, that the intention is to use binary chemical weapons at the very start of hostilities on the European continent in conjunction with nuclear weapons. Nor is it an accident that the United States is trying by hook or by crook to get its NATO allies to agree to improve the bloc's chemical armaments by replacing the stocks of "silent death" housed in West Europe with more modern toxic agents.

As is known, at the end of May the U.S. Senate decided to allocate to the Pentagon large appropriations to prepare for and launch the production of binary weapons. Then the House of Representatives yielded to pressure from the administration and allotted \$124.5 million for that purpose in fiscal 1986.

The Peoples' Mounting Alarm

The dangerous U.S. plans to prepare for chemical warfare are causing indignation and resistance on the part of the peoples of many countries, including Europeans. This mood was reflected by a joint political initiative promulgated in June by the SED and the Social Democratic Party of Germany, the major opposition party in the FRG, on the question of the creation in Europe of a zone free of chemical weapons. These proposals envisage as the first step the creation of a zone on the territory of the GDR, FRG, and CSSR. Noting the danger posed by the currently existing chemical arma-

ments, both parties expressed anxiety in connection with the new military technical developments in the field which "pose a threat of new dimensions to mankind and make it much harder to achieve an accord on disarmament."

A chemical arms race, which is what Washington is aiming at, would postpone the prospect of the prohibition of chemical weapons, poison the international atmosphere even more, and exacerbate military confrontation as a whole. It is in the interests of the whole of mankind to prevent this course of events. The peoples are demanding that the prohibition of chemical weapons become a reality. But for this to happen it is necessary for all states -- and above all, of course, the United States -- to display a constructive approach in Geneva. The U.S. attempts to use the talks as a cover will not succeed. If one acts on the basis of reason and responsibility for the future, the question of chemical weapons can and must be solved. They must be outlawed by means of a treaty.

CSO: 5200/1317

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS HITS SHULTZ'S 'THREATS' TO NEW ZEALAND

LD181851 Moscow TASS in English 1820 GMT 18 Jul 85

["Does Washington Hope for Victory in a Nuclear War?" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow July 18 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Leonid Ponomarev writes:

The United States intends to wage a nuclear war and win it, if its efforts are not "hampered" by such an ally as New Zealand. This is the implication of the statement made by George Shultz, U.S. secretary of state, in Honolulu, where he was on a stop-over on Wednesday on his way back from a tour of a number of Southeast Asian and Pacific countries. Addressing the local centre for the study of East-West relations, the U.S. secretary of state again lashed out against New Zealand and issued threats against that country for her anti-nuclear policy. He went so far as to say that Wellington's stand is almost the main obstacle in the way of the West's efforts to "prevent nuclear war".

As follows from an AP agency report, George Shultz said that New Zealand weak regional stability, which, as he put it, is one of the most important links in the efforts to prevent nuclear [words indistinct] George Shultz, that New Zealand undermines the positions and chances of the West at making success in the field of arms control (sic).

But who will believe that under the present-day international situation it takes the efforts of New Zealand alone to prevent the threat of a nuclear catastrophe or curb the arms race? The U.S. secretary of state needed these "arguments" only to recall the main point of Washington's strategy that all the military alliances of the USA with its partners, whether they be in the West or in the Pacific, are orientated at the possibility of a nuclear war breaking out, from which the American strategists hope to emerge victorious.

The allies of the USA, as George Shultz said, should make "sacrifices". Albeit in their public statements spokesmen for the administration declared more than once that nuclear war was unthinkable, that there would be no victors in it, Shultz proclaimed in Honolulu something diametrically opposite.

Implying the allies of the USA in different blocs, including in ANZUS, which incorporates Australia, New Zealand and the USA, George Shultz said that should a war break out, they must not only come to each other's assistance, but also ensure by "joint efforts" the ability to fight and win that war. This is what turns out, according to the U.S. secretary of state, to be the policy of "detering the enemy."

Considering that a number of states of the southern Pacific, including Australia and New Zealand, favour removal of the nuclear weapons from that area, and the USA is categorically against that, it is easy to see what war the representative of the U.S. Administration bears in mind. Shultz demanded from the allies "unity" on the American programme for the deployment of a large-scale anti-ballistic missile system with space based elements, i.e. unconditional support for the "star wars" plans.

Such are the real underlying reasons for the harsh criticism of the U.S. Administration against those who really wish to protect themselves from nuclear threat.

CSO: 5200/1319

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

PRAVDA VIEWS CANCELING OF ANZUS MEETING, CANBERRA TALKS

PM221148 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Jul 85 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent O. Skalkin dispatch: "Duet Instead of Trio"]

[Text] Sydney, 17 Jul -- U.S.-Australian talks that have replaced the ANSUZ bloc's annual meeting, which had previously been held for 33 consecutive years, have been held in Canberra.

Washington's desire that the 34th meeting be called off so as to prevent participation in the conference by New Zealand, whose decision to close its ports to the U.S. nuclear fleet infuriated the Americans.

The final communique on the results of the talks stresses the importance of permitting ships and aircraft (specifically, American ones) access to the allied countries' ports and airfields. U.S. Secretary of State Shultz, who attended the talks, obtained from Australia's labor leaders the assurances and guarantees on that score needed by the Pentagon.

The U.S. representatives tore into New Zealand with still greater impudence. At the press conference held after the meeting, the head of the U.S. foreign policy department, threatening New Zealand with the usual reprisals, issued a demand in the form of an ultimatum that Wellington abandon its intention to enshrine the government's antinuclear course in a special law.

The Americans, incidentally, show no greater respect for Australia when its representatives express views that do not suit the United States. For instance, what Shultz said with regard to Canberra's official stance on the "star wars" question constitutes overt pressure on its junior partner -- overt but unsuccessful. Foreign Minister W. Hayden, the FINANCIAL REVIEW newspaper writes, "reaffirmed Australia's refusal to support the U.S. 'star wars' program."

The idea of setting up a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific, which Australia supports, also gave rise to debate. Shultz deemed it necessary to publicly express "serious reservations" about the plans to create such a zone.

The foolish anti-Soviet rhetoric to which the U.S. representatives in Canberra shamelessly resorted did not help them hide the obvious. The United States does not value independent initiative in an ally -- much less on questions of peace and disarmament -- but blind emulation of Washington. The Canberra meeting was yet another graphic example of that.

CSO: 5200/1319

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

AUSTRALIAN PRIME MINISTER ON U.S. REACTION TO NZ PROPOSAL

HK181144 Hong Kong AFP in English 1116 GMT 18 Jul 85

[Text] Canberra, July 18 (AFP) -- Australian Prime Minister Bob Hawke said today it would be "not unnatural" for the United States to review the ANZUS defence treaty, if New Zealand passed a law banning nuclear-capable ships from its ports.

The proposed legislation would make statutory an administrative decision earlier this year by the New Zealand Labour government.

That decision banned U.S. nuclear powered ships and ships capable of carrying nuclear weapons from New Zealand. They had visited earlier under the ANZUS pact linking the United States, Australia and New Zealand.

Washington reacted to the ban by suspending its defence relations with Wellington under the 34-year-old treaty.

Earlier this week in Canberra Mr. Hawke and Australian Foreign Minister Bill Hayden had bilateral talks with U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz, in place of an annual tripartite ministerial level ANZUS council meeting.

Mr. Hawke said today: "Clearly were New Zealand to do that it is not unnatural to expect that the U.S. would have another look at the situation."

CSO: 5200/4342

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

SEYCHELLES MINISTER CALLS FOR INDIAN OCEAN NFZ

Victoria NATION in English 20 Jun 85 p 3

[Text]

"SEYCHELLES and India, along with several nations in the region, strongly support the view that the Indian Ocean must be kept free from the deployment of nuclear weapons and the military presence of the superpowers and other non-littoral countries," said Mr Ogilvy Berlouis, Minister of Youth and Defence, on his return from his recent visit to India.

During his stay in the Indian capital, New Delhi, he had talks with the Indian Prime Minister, Mr Rajiv Gandhi, the Minister of Defence, Mr P V Narasimha Rao, and the Minister of State for Foreign Affairs, Mr Khurshid Alam Khan. He also visited several defence installations including India's Western Naval Base in Bombay before returning to Victoria.

Commenting on his visit to the subcontinent at the invitation of his Indian counterpart, Mr Narasimha Rao, and the growing Indo-Seychelles relationship, Mr Berlouis said: "The common grounds between India and Seychelles are both historical and vast. The two countries, apart from their ethnic affinity and consistent stand against neocolonialism and apartheid, have a shared non-aligned foreign policy and a strong and vigorous commitment to the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

In respect of Seychelles, Mr Berlouis said India was ready to further strengthen cooperation between the two states and provide training facilities in any fields. "Mr Rajiv Gandhi himself assured me that India will be prepared to help Seychelles in providing any kind of training we may need."

Mr Berlouis added: "India has a large and a very good navy and we believe that there could be a re-

ciprocal cooperation between the two countries, which are bound by strong bonds of friendship and an inspired quest for peace in the region."

Replying to a question on India's new leader, Mr Berlouis said that there was no doubt that Mr Rajiv Gandhi was guiding the Indian ship of state and its nearly 800 million people in the right direction. "He is intelligent, clear in his mind, warm, and, for a man who works nearly 20 hours on most days, relaxed and very much in control of the affairs of the government. His leadership, following the trail set by his mother, Mrs Indira Gandhi, has brought a fresh new hope for peace.

"The issue that deeply concerns us is the growing militarization of the region. The proposal to declare the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace," Mr Berlouis said, "still drags on. The international conference that was to have been held under the auspices of the United Nations is already long overdue.

"There is a UN Ad Hoc Committee dealing with this subject and the declaration that we await for is in the interests of the littoral states. It is unfortunate that the outside powers who ride high on an ocean that is ours have not responded to the call of these states," regretted Mr Berlouis.

Most of the states in the Indian

Ocean area, whose population accounts for nearly one-third of the total population of the world, won political independence relatively recently and are now struggling for economic independence. They are vitally interested in concentrating their efforts and resources on the solution of their social, economic and political problems. It is of exceptional importance for them not to be involved in the arms race which swallows up enormous resources so badly needed to meet their development requirements.

In view of this, the Government of Sri Lanka under the leadership of Prime Minister Mrs Srima Bandaranaike, as far back as 1970 when her socialist party was swept into power, proposed that the Indian Ocean be proclaimed as a Zone of Peace.

In 1971, at the request of Sri Lanka, the item was included in the agenda of the 26th session of the UN General Assembly. In a resolution adopted by a majority vote, the General Assembly declared the Indian Ocean a Zone of Peace. It called on the great powers to enter into consultations with the littoral states at once, with a view to halting the further expansion of their military presence, dismantling all bases and other military installations and military supply facilities, and ruling out the deployment there of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction.

An important step towards the implementation of this idea was the Meeting of the Littoral and Hinterland States of the Indian Ocean held in 1979, where the contours of the future Zone of Peace emerged.

In the same year, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution providing for the convocation of an international conference on the Indian Ocean in Colombo, Sri Lanka. In the course of six sessions of the UN Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, considerable work was done in preparation for the conference; its agenda and structure were outlined and even the date for it was set—December 1981. But the conference has not been convened yet.

Reacting to this impasse, Mr Berliouis said that in the present tense international situation, determined action by all peace-loving states and peoples is more important than ever for the realization of the non-aligned countries initiative to make the Indian Ocean a Zone of Peace.

The Indian Ocean has, in recent years, become economically and strategically important in world affairs. Most of the oil from the Middle East to the West and Japan passes through the Indian Ocean, and certain big powers have found it necessary to establish total control over it. There has so far been total disregard of the wishes of the peoples of the area because the big powers are determined to protect their vested interests either for economic reasons or for purely military strategy in an attempt to continue their domination over other nations.

President Albert Rene has expressed in no uncertain terms that the consequence of a confrontation in this part of the world will be too catastrophic for us, and a major confrontation along the oil route is of greater and of far more immediate concern to us than to any of the potential conflicting powers.

"It is vital for the superpowers to realize and recognise that they with all their might, have a moral obligation to safeguard the territorial integrity of the smaller states and no country should be vulnerable to any external attacks or even interference in their own affairs. The presence of superpower military interests in the Indian Ocean not only increases the risks of war but also helps to create conflicts and tension that could affect the stability of countries in the region," observed Mr Berliouis.

Peace and harmony

"An ethic of non-violence must be at the heart of all efforts to ensure peace and harmony in the world, and the late Mrs. Indira Gandhi had always urged that the central issue in securing wider progress on disarmament was the stopping of nuclear arms proliferation. In this respect, the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace would be a mighty example in a world riddled with fear, hatred and tension," said Mr Berliouis.

"The Indian Ocean has much potential to contribute towards the development of the countries in the region. Whether it is for the exploitation of ocean foods or minerals or even for the conversion of ocean features such as currents, temperature and continental shelves as sources of energy, the contribution this ocean can make towards the development of the littoral states is

tremendous."

"All littoral states," Mr Berliouis emphasised, "have a common destiny, and we in this region have to help each other on so many fronts of national and regional development. Above all, we have to help to

keep the waters of the Indian Ocean free from any kind of activity that threatens peace in the region and our own well-being.

Aspirations

"India," Mr Berliouis said, "has, over the last few years, increased not only its stature as a nation totally committed to search for disarmament and global peace, but also its technological capacity to use science as a means to solve the kind of human problems that beset developing countries in particular. In many fields of agricultural and industrial activities, India has progressed at a great pace. The country's scientists have carried out extensive ocean research programmes, the results of which are highly promising and would be of great significance to the littoral states of the Indian Ocean. This is another area in which there is cooperation between India and Seychelles."

In conclusion, Mr Berliouis said that if the nations of the Indian Ocean were allowed to develop their own countries and the lot of their people according to their aspirations without any interference whatsoever, and if the call of the littoral states for the recognition of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace was responded to by the superpowers, this region could very well become the cradle for peace among nations and peoples of the world.

NUCLEAR TESTING

GORBACHEV ANNOUNCES NUCLEAR EXPLOSION MORATORIUM

PM291547 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jul 85 First Edition p 1

["Statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] The continuing arms race carries within it tremendous dangers for the future of the whole world civilization. It leads to the growth of tension in the international arena and the intensification of the war threat, diverting colossal intellectual and material resources from creative objectives.

From the very beginning of the nuclear era the Soviet Union has waged a consistent and vigorous struggle to end the buildup of nuclear arsenals, curb military rivalry, and strengthen confidence and peaceful coexistence between states. All the USSR's activity within the UN framework and at multilateral and bilateral talks on arms limitation and reduction questions -- activity carried out on an enormous scale -- is subordinated to this. The Soviet Union does not seek military supremacy, it advocates maintaining equilibrium of military forces at the lowest possible level.

It is our conviction that the ending of all nuclear weapon tests would constitute an important contribution to the strengthening of strategic stability and peace on earth, for it is no secret that new and even more dangerous forms and types of weapons of mass destruction are developed and perfected [otrabatyvayutaya i sovershenstvuyutaya] in the process of such tests.

In the interests of creating favorable conditions for the conclusion of an international treaty on the total and universal prohibition of nuclear weapons agree on a moratorium on any nuclear explosions as of a mutually agreed date. Unfortunately, as yet it has not proved possible to implement this important step.

In a desire to promote the ending of the dangerous competition in the buildup of nuclear arsenals and wishing to set a good example, the Soviet Union has adopted a decision to unilaterally end any nuclear explosions as of 6 August this year [prekratit v odnostronnem poryadke lyubyye yadernyye vzyvy, machinaya s 6 avgusta seg goda]. We urge the government of the United States to end nuclear explosions as of the same date, which is marked throughout the world as the day of the Hiroshima tragedy. Our moratorium is declared through 1 January 1986. It will continue to remain in effect beyond that date, however, if the United States for its part refrains from conducting nuclear explosions.

There is no doubt that a reciprocal moratorium by the USSR and the United States on any nuclear explosions would also serve as a good example for other states possessing nuclear weapons.

The Soviet Union expects that the United States will react positively to this initiative and end its nuclear explosions.

This would be in keeping with all people's aspirations and hopes.

NUCLEAR TESTING

USSR ON RESPONSES TO GORBACHEV MORATORIUM ANNOUNCEMENT

TASS Hits U.S. Response

LD301133 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1022 GMT 30 Jul 85

[TASS headline: "Moscow's Goodwill and Washington's Maneuvers"]

The USSR, which is in favor of a full and general ban on nuclear weapons tests and wishing to set a good example, has made the decision to unilaterally stop nuclear explosions, beginning from 6 August. The new important initiative of the USSR is the center of attention of the international public and press. Of course, the responses coming in vary -- they depend on whose interests are being expressed by the mass media. But if we highlight the main thing, the fundamental thing, there is every justification for saying the Soviet initiative has been evaluated everywhere as an exceptionally important constructive action directed at promoting an end to the dangerous competition in increasing nuclear arsenals.

The U.S. Administration has also responded to the Soviet initiative. But it has done so in a special Washington way... [TASS ellipsis]

In Washington, by all accounts, they did not even take the trouble to analyze the Soviet proposal seriously. The teletype machines had not even been able to report this proposal when a representative of the administration issued a standard statement that the Soviet initiative was allegedly aimed at "freezing Soviet superiority". U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz, repeating the same conjectures, stated in plain terms that Washington will not work toward the establishment of a moratorium because allegedly that is "not in the interests of the United States."

Evidently realizing that a negative reaction of this kind is too revealing in regard to the United States' militarist plans, they simultaneously launched a "cover-up" operation in Washington, zealously advertising their own "initiative", the essence of which is that the United States is supposedly willing to invite Soviet observers to the next underground nuclear weapon test. But this initiative -- if such it may be called -- means that the Washington administration is proposing not an end to competition in the build-up of nuclear arsenals, but merely the registration of the ever-rising dimensions of these arsenals. And all this is being done to the accompaniment of claims that it is not the United States but the USSR that is striving for military superiority!

Such a stand cannot be called anything other than a mockery of common sense. It is more than obvious that in putting forward its "counterinitiative", Washington is striving not to curb the arms race, but for directly opposing aims; it intends to continue using nuclear weapons tests for the modernization and development of nuclear weapons, and is planning to continue the implementation of its gigantic military programs.

Washington's attempt to, as they say, reject out of hand the fresh peace-loving initiative of the USSR is just one of many examples illustrating the United States'

approach to the problem of ending the arms race. It is well known, for example, that the Soviet Union came out in favor of establishing a moratorium on the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe, backing up this proposal with an important practical step -- ceasing to deploy such missiles. How did the United States respond? Not only did it refuse to agree to the moratorium, it stepped up the siting of first strike weapons in the FRG, and intensified pressure on Belgium and the Netherlands in order to turn those countries into launch pads for the Pentagon.

It is well known that 2 years ago the USSR took on the unilateral obligation not to be the first to convey any sort of antisatellite weapons into outer space. How did the United States reply? They not only did not join the Soviet initiative but, on the contrary, they continue feverish preparations for the militarization of space, and moreover, Pentagon Chief C. Weinberger, for example, states directly that he "excludes the possibility" of abandoning this dangerous course.

It is well known that the USSR persistently proposed and proposes to establish for the whole period of the negotiations in Geneva a moratorium on nuclear and space weapons. How does the United States reply? By all methods evading a businesslike reply to this initiative; they continue to pursue an unrestrained inflation of the arms race, throwing ever more billions of dollars on preparations for Earth and star wars. The Pentagon budget for the 1986 financial year exceeds, as is reported, \$300 billion -- a record sum in the history of the country.

As we can see, any, literally any Soviet proposal aimed at halting and reversing the increased material preparations for war meets with resolute opposition from Washington. "A king's final argument" was the inscription which Kaiser Wilhelm II of Germany put on the barrels of his cannon. It is difficult to say whether the Washington strategists write anything other than "Made in the USA" on their missiles, bombs, and laser devices, although it appears that they regard these missiles, bombs, and space weapons as something like a decisive argument in their desire to redraw the political map of the planet. This has again been confirmed by Washington itself, having rejected the Soviet proposal to halt nuclear explosions...[TASS ellipsis]

Japanese Public Welcomes Moratorium

LD300708 Moscow TASS in English 0653 GMT 30 Jul 85

[Text] Tokyo July 30 TASS -- The Japanese public has received with inspiration and optimism the statement by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, about the Soviet Union's decision to terminate unilaterally any nuclear explosions starting from August 6 this year. This statement gives fresh vigour to the international movement of peace champions, Masatoshi Sakoda, general secretary of the Hiroshima organisation of the victims of the U.S. atomic bombing, told a TASS correspondent. The USSR's unilateral refusal to conduct nuclear weapons tests will have a salutary impact on the world situation and create possibilities for a sharp turn towards improving the political climate in the world and eliminating nuclear arsenals.

The fact that this valuable initiative is timed for August 6 -- 40 years of the tragedy of Hiroshima, which was erased from the face of the earth by a U.S. atomic bomb, arouses deep satisfaction among the entire Japanese people. The residents of our city, Masatoshi Sakoda said, are indignant over the stand of Washington which refuses to follow the USSR's example.

The statement by the Soviet leader about the unilateral termination of nuclear tests is a step of good will meeting the aspirations of the whole of mankind, said Katsuchi Fukabori, chairman of the council of the victims of the U.S. atomic bombing of Nagasaki. We demand that the U.S. Administration heed the voice of reason and respond to the USSR's peace proposal.

Center for Defense Information

LD291905 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1825 GMT 29 Jul 85

[Text] Washington, Jul 29 (TASS) -- The moratorium on all nuclear explosions from 6 August this year announced unilaterally by the Soviet Union, and the call to the U.S. Administration to join in this historic initiative will greatly facilitate the achievement of an agreement on the limitation and reduction of nuclear weapons, retired Admirals Gene LaRoque and Eugene Carroll, heads of the public organization the Washington Center for Defense Information, have pointed out.

In a special statement, the Center for Defense Information stresses that it utterly and completely approves this step by the Soviet Union. It also appeals to the U.S. administration to support this noble initiative immediately, for it is a most important and effective step on the path toward saving mankind from the threat of nuclear catastrophe.

CSO: 5200/1332

NUCLEAR TESTING

TASS ON U.S. INVITATION TO OBSERVE NUCLEAR TEST

LD291937 Moscow TASS in English 1927 GMT 29 Jul 85

[Text] Washington Jul 29 TASS -- TASS correspondent Alek'sandr Lyutiy reports:

The White House announced with much pomp today that the Reagan administration has offered the Soviet Union to send its representatives to be present at a new nuclear weapon test at the range in the American state of Nevada. On describing this proposal as "far reaching" the assistant White House press secretary, Speakes, contended that it supposedly demonstrated the administration's striving to achieve verifiable limitations on nuclear weapon tests.

It does not take a deep analysis of the American "initiative", however, to realise that it does not contain any novelty and pursues the sole aim of diverting the public's attention from the Administration's reluctance to reach agreement on cardinaly important questions of limiting the arms race, and in particular on the question of limiting and banning nuclear weapon tests.

By again inviting the Soviet Union to exchange "observers" at nuclear weapon tests the American Administration suggests actually only to register nuclear blasts and thus to legalise them. At the same time it has stubbornly resisted and continues to resist steps towards banning nuclear weapon tests. This is illustrated, for instance, by the unilateral suspension by the United States of the talks with the USSR and Britain on the conclusion of a treaty on the general and complete prohibition of nuclear weapon tests.

CSO: 5200/1332

NUCLEAR TESTING

BRIEFS

SWEDES REPORT SOVIET BLAST--The Swedish National Defense Research Institute observatory at Hagfors registered a powerful underground nuclear explosion in the Semipalatinsk area in the USSR at about 0230 today. The explosion measured 6.8 on the Richter scale. So far this year, the USSR has carried out six underground explosions of nuclear charges, while the United States has carried out seven. [Text] [Stockholm Domestic Service in Swedish 1640 GMT 20 Jul 85 LD]

CSO: 5200/1317

END

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

August 16, 1985